

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

JOSÉ ROBLES

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

HAZELTON SPENCER

## CONTENTS

DENKINGER, MARC.—La Candidature de Sainte-Beuve à l'Ecole Normale en 1834, - - - - -	421
SEITZ, R. W.—Goldsmith and the 'Present State of the British Empire,'	434
CASKEY, J. H.—Truth and Fiction in Eighteenth-Century Newspapers, -	438
FERGUSON, J. DeL.—Burns and Hugh Blair, - - - - -	440
BABCOCK, R. W.—The Attack of the late Eighteenth Century upon Alterations of Shakespeare's Plays, - - - - -	446
NEWLIN, C. M.—The Theatre and the Apprentices, - - - - -	451
SIMMONS, E. J.—Pushkin and Shenstone, - - - - -	451
PIERCE, F. E.—Scott and Hoffmann, - - - - -	457
BAKER, C. D.—A Note on Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale,' - - - - -	460
WILLOUGHBY, E. E.—Phrases Marking the Terminations of Acts in the First Folio, - - - - -	463
COOPER, LANE.—Coleridge and Sir John Davies Again, - - - - -	464
GOULD, C. N.—Gematria, - - - - -	465
MARTIN, BURNS.—Richardson's Removal to Salisbury Court, - - -	469

## REVIEWS:—

M. M. BELDEN, The Dramatic Works of Samuel Foote. [E. B. Watson.]	469
R. K. ROOT, The Dunciad Variorum. [G. Sherburn.] - - - - -	472
L. BETTANY, Diaries of W. J. Temple. [F. A. Pottle.] - - - - -	474
G. D. SANDERS, Elizabeth Gaskell. [J. R. Foster.] - - - - -	476
G. B. PARKS, Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages. [A. W. Secord.]	477
E. G. JACOB, Daniel Defoe; GERINDA ROORDA, Realism in De Foe's Narratives of Adventure. [A. W. Secord.] - - - - -	479
H. E. ROLLINS, The Pepys Ballads. [Louise Pound.] - - - - -	480
W. HOFSTAETTER UND U. PETERS, Sachwörterbuch der Deutschkunde. [E. Feise.] - - - - -	481
HERMANN PONGS, Das Bild in der Dichtung. [E. Feise.] - - - - -	482
STITH THOMPSON, Tales of the North American Indians. [R. T. Christiansen.] - - - - -	483
A. FOULET, Le Couronnement de Renard. [G. Frank.] - - - - -	485

**BRIEF MENTION:** of A. WARREN, Pope as Critic and Humanist; T. E. WELBY, Hogg, 'The Poetical Mirror'; The F. N. Scott Anniversary Papers; A. W. ROBERTS, The Kailyard School of Fiction; R. DEWAR, Burns Poetry and Prose; H. D. GRAY, Selections from Old Testament Literature; G. F. BRADBY, About English Poetry; M. MEAD, Four Studies in Wordsworth, - - - 486

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

## EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,  
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Robles

## ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, E. Greenlaw,  
R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00  
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries  
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, *not* vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the *total* number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS OF SPANISH

*To round out your college courses, these stories from the Spanish classics are presented in separate volumes. They are carefully selected and edited with vocabularies.*

Rivas' Don Alvaro—Rosenberg and Templin edition . . . . \$1.25  
Terreros' Libro de Lectura—Rosenberg edition . . . . . \$1.00

*The following, 70 cents each*

Los Cuatro Viajes de Cristóbal Colón—Entwistle edition  
Romanos' Cinco Escenas Matritenses  
Azorín's Al Margen de Los Clásicos  
Ruiz' Stories from Spanish History  
De Larra's Cinco Artículos  
Mariana's Historia de España  
Unamuno's Recuerdos de Niñez y de Mocedad  
Caballero's La Noche de Navidad Callar en Vida y Perdonar en Muerte  
Ruiz' Un Verano en Santander

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK

TORONTO







# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLV

NOVEMBER, 1930

Number 7

---

## LA CANDIDATURE DE SAINTE-BEUVE A L'ECOLE NORMALE EN 1834

On sait qu'en 1858, quand l'Ecole Normale se rouvrit, sous la direction de Nisard, Sainte-Beuve accepta le poste de maître de conférences et que, pendant trois ans, il vint causer à la rue d'Ulm. On sait moins que Sainte-Beuve avait déjà brigué ce même poste, un quart de siècle plus tôt, en 1834. C'est de Mme Lenormant que les biographes du critique ont reçu leur version de cette candidature. Herriot la résume exactement:

Lorsque [Sainte-Beuve] voulut entrer dans l'enseignement et remplacer Ampère<sup>1</sup> à l'Ecole Normale, Mme Lenormant<sup>2</sup> se chargea d'agir auprès de Guizot; l'impatience de Sainte-Beuve fut cause que l'affaire ne put se conclure. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Mme Lenormant avait été l'intermédiaire officiel d'Ampère auprès du ministre. Son témoignage a donc grand poids. Néanmoins il propage une erreur. On en découvre d'autres en remontant aux documents originaux déjà publiés. Nous comptons nous borner à éclairer quelques points de cet épisode très complexe. Il

<sup>1</sup> Ampère venait de succéder à Andrieux au Collège de France. Il désirait publier son cours. Sa tâche de maître de conférences était un obstacle et un fardeau. Voir les allusions dans sa lettre du 21 sept. 1834 à Mme Récamier (A-M. Ampère et J-J. Ampère, *Corr. et Souv.* [Nous désignerons cet ouvrage dorénavant ainsi: *Corr. des Ampère*], II, p. 61): "vie douloureuse; torture physique et morale; épreuve où mon cerveau pourrait bien rester." Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Lundis* (3<sup>e</sup> éd. 1874), XI, 483 (Notes et Pensées, CI): "J-J. Ampère—cet homme d'esprit qui causait avec tant d'agrément et qui professait d'une manière si pénible."

<sup>2</sup> Nièce de Mme Récamier, et femme de l'archéologue Ch. Lenormant, alors suppléant de Guizot à la Sorbonne.

<sup>3</sup> E. Herriot, *Mme Récamier et ses amis* (2<sup>e</sup> éd. 1906), II, 311.

faudra les situer dans le cadre de la biographie générale du maître des *Lundis* pour en saisir la pleine signification.

La première phase de l'affaire de Sainte-Beuve, comme on disait, fut celle des négociations de Mme Lenormant.<sup>4</sup> Ampère avait offert sa démission, mais en stipulant que Sainte-Beuve lui succéderait. Or celui-ci n'était pas du tout l'homme que Guizot rêvait pour l'Ecole Normale. Le ministre négligeait la question politique;<sup>5</sup> il voulait bien ne tenir nul compte de ce que le candidat collaborait encore au *National*, organe des républicains qui l'attaquaient chaque jour. Mais il ne pouvait oublier le thuriféraire de l'école romantique, celui qui, selon le mot de Heine, avait couru devant Hugo, annonçant partout le "Buffle de la poésie". Il se souvenait de Joseph Delorme, qu'il avait surnommé lui-même un Werther jacobin et carabin. Guère l'homme à qui confier la formation des futurs professeurs! Son *Ronsard* et son *Tableau du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, qu'étaient-ce sinon les pièces les plus ingénieuses d'une machine d'assaut lancée par derrière sur l'hémistiche vénérable: "Enfin Malherbe vint"! Bref Guizot omettait le folliculaire politique, mais il tenait au polémiste littéraire . . . afin de l'écarter.

Ampère était décidé à quitter sa place, mais il refusait à Guizot sa démission pure et simple et résistait en faveur de Sainte-Beuve, qui n'aurait eu aucune chance de se faire agréer sans lui. Au début de septembre, une quinzaine après le départ d'Ampère pour l'Italie, où il passa ses vacances, on lui transmet une offre de compromis ainsi conçue:

Si au roman de *Volupté*,<sup>6</sup> M. de Sainte-Beuve (*sic*) fait succéder un travail sérieux et réalise son plan de l'*Histoire littéraire de Port-Royal*<sup>7</sup> il

<sup>4</sup> Suivre le détail de cette première phase dans les correspondances suivantes: 13 août, de Fauriel à Mohl; 15 août, de Mohl à Fauriel (*Corr. de Fauriel et de Mary Clarke*, 1911, p. 393, 394); 5 sept., de Sainte-Beuve à Ampère (*Corr. des Ampère*, II, p. 58; reproduite dans la *Corr. de Sainte-Beuve*, 1877, I, 23); 21 sept., de Fauriel à Mohl (*Corr. de Fauriel*, p. 394); 21 sept., d'Ampère à Mme Lenormant (*Mme Récamier et les Amis de sa Jeunesse*, 1874, p. 292); 21 sept., d'Ampère à Mme Récamier (*Corr. des Ampères*, II, 61).

<sup>5</sup> Voir le beau témoignage d'Ampère, dans sa lettre du 21 sept. à Mme Lenormant (cf. note précédente).

<sup>6</sup> Paru le 19 juillet 1834.

<sup>7</sup> Première mention, que je sache, du futur grand œuvre.

établira, aux yeux de tous, ses droits universitaires et autorisera M. Guizot à le faire entrer à l'Ecole Normale. Pour le moment sa nomination est impossible; consentez donc à continuer la conférence pendant une année, et M. le Ministre offre à votre ami la chance de vous remplacer. Il ne peut faire plus et ne doit accepter aucune condition.<sup>8</sup>

On ne nous a pas dit qui était l'auteur de cette note. Ballanche avait écrit à Ampère, dans le même sens, de la part de Mme Récamier; mais, au tour officiel du style, on croit reconnaître la main de l'intermédiaire officiel, Mme Lenormant. Non moins significatif, le contraste établi entre *Volupté* et "un travail sérieux"; il semble venir d'elle. Impressionnée par un titre spécieux, la nièce si bien élevée de Mme Récamier a-t-elle jamais lu *Volupté*? Cet ouvrage que Lamennais et "la plupart des catholiques de ce temps-là", selon l'abbé Brémond, appelèrent une *œuvre de charité, une œuvre de chrétien*,<sup>9</sup> en connut-elle autre chose que ce que lui apprirent les potinages de salon sur les clés de *Volupté*, qui coururent bientôt jusqu'en province?<sup>10</sup> Quarante ans après l'événement, elle croyait encore que Guizot s'était "refusé à une nomination immédiate qui eût semblé la récompense d'une œuvre à coup sûr peu morale "et qu'il demandait qu'Ampère "laissât au spirituel critique le temps de produire un livre plus en harmonie que *Volupté* avec la *gravité du professorat*." <sup>11</sup> On croirait entendre *Pancirole*<sup>12</sup> en personne, au lieu de sa digne veuve!

Mais, au fait, Mme Lenormant dit vrai peut-être. *Volupté* venait de paraître. Les ennuis du gouvernement étaient sérieux. Guizot, fort occupé, était-il mieux renseigné qu'elle? Avait-il trouvé le loisir de se plonger dans ces deux volumes de prose serrée? On en vient à soupçonner que le sort de Sainte-Beuve fut, en ce cas, discuté par deux personnes qui jugeaient un écrivain

<sup>8</sup> Corr. des Ampère, II, p. 60.

<sup>9</sup> Le mot est de Lamennais: H. Brémond, *Le Roman et l'Histoire d'une Conversion*—U. Guttinger et Sainte-Beuve, 1925, p. 157. L'auteur note, p. 163, que *Volupté* a passé pour un livre dangereux dans les milieux antichrétiens de 1834.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158.

<sup>11</sup> *Mme Récamier et ses Amis* (2<sup>e</sup> éd. 1906), p. 292. C'est moi qui souligne.

<sup>12</sup> Voir sous ce nom un portrait-caractère de Ch. Lenormant dans les *Lundis* (6<sup>e</sup> éd.), XI, 414.

sans avoir connaissance de la production la plus significative de son talent, celle où se manifestaient les tendances profondes (et si "sérieuses"!) de sa nature et de son esprit. Cet accident n'est pas nouveau dans le chemin de la fortune. Mais ne nous plaignons pas. Ce fut Guizot qui exigea de Sainte-Beuve son travail de maîtrise, *Port-Royal*. Sainte-Beuve n'eut pas le poste; mais il écrivit le livre. Veut-on savoir le danger qu'un Guizot mieux informé nous aurait fait courir? Au lieu de *Port-Royal*, nous aurions eu cette *Histoire de la littérature française* (il y en a tant!) qu'il pensa tirer de ses notes de cours, après 1861. Les *Nouveaux Lundis* ne lui en laissèrent pas le loisir. Au reste, la fatalité a ses raisons de produire les *Histoires de la littérature*; on le sait en mille choses. Celle que Sainte-Beuve aurait, sans doute, écrite, devait être écrite et le fut, mais par un homme dont le talent se montra admirable dans la composition d'un manuel. Nous serions moins riches de ne pas l'avoir. C'est l'œuvre de D. Nisard. Car il succéda à Ampère: il fut l'homme du choix de Guizot.

Ce rival heureux de Sainte-Beuve, je ne sais pourquoi, n'a jusqu'ici attiré l'attention de personne, en cette occurrence. Nisard a pourtant laissé des *Souvenirs*, qui furent publiés par sa famille et que l'on ne saurait négliger.<sup>13</sup> Le récit de sa nomination à l'Ecole Normale, avec l'histoire de ses premiers rapports avec Sainte-Beuve, occupe le premier chapitre, daté (tous les autres chapitres ne le sont pas) de 1870. Comme Sainte-Beuve est mort en 1869 et que Nisard lui a dû "le plus grand chagrin de sa vie" (la perte de la direction de l'Ecole Normale à la suite des troubles occasionnés par le discours de Sainte-Beuve au Sénat sur les Bibliothèques populaires, en 1867), ce morceau a tout l'air d'être un des plus anciens que le vieil universitaire ait composés, un des premiers auxquels il ait pensé, pour cette sorte de déposition, *pro domo sua*, que font les auteurs de mémoires devant la postérité.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> D. Nisard, *Souvenirs et Notes biographiques*, 2 vols., 1888.

<sup>14</sup> La réputation de Nisard, en 1834, était toute récente. En décembre 1833, il s'était distingué par une sortie contre la *littérature facile* et avait soutenu une polémique brillante avec J. Janin. En avril, il avait fait paraître en deux volumes, ses *Etudes de Mœurs et de Critique sur les Poètes latins de la Décadence* (parues dans les Revues depuis 1830). Nisard s'était ainsi créé, trois mois avant *Volupté*, un titre universitaire,

Nisard raconte qu'il hésita quand le ministre lui offrit de venir professer ses doctrines à l'Ecole Normale. Il demanda l'avis de Carrel. Le rôle du fameux journaliste dans cette affaire mérite d'être observé de près. On sait que, sur la fin de septembre, Sainte-Beuve s'était brouillé avec le *National* (le journal de Carrel) à la suite des avanies qu'il essuya<sup>15</sup> pour son article sur Ballanche (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 sept.). Carrel, inculpé politique, vivait alors détenu dans une maison de santé. Les "flâneurs de haute hâblerie républicaine" qui poursuivaient Sainte-Beuve, l'invoquaient sans cesse comme arbitre. Ce Bayard du journalisme — dont l'année précédente Sainte-Beuve vantait la "conduite si généreuse," la "constance morale et la loyauté qui, chez M. Carrel, ne varient pas plus que le talent"<sup>16</sup> — se déroba dans un silence obstiné. Sainte-Beuve fut outré. Il ne remit plus les pieds au *National*, même pour réclamer le solde des articles qui lui étaient dûs. Cette brouille eut deux effets importants. Sainte-Beuve quitta tout à fait la politique et se rejeta vers les lettres. Mais d'abord, il ambitionna le poste de l'Ecole Normale avec une ardeur redoublée; il veilla qu'Ampère, malgré ses vacillations, tint bon en sa faveur. Le succès de sa candidature, c'était non seulement la consécration officielle de son mérite, mais une double victoire d'indépendance et vis-à-vis de Guizot qui l'excluait et vis-à-vis du *National* qui le répudiait.

au sens où Guizot l'entendait. Il n'y manquait même pas un certain air de riposter au *Tableau du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Nisard démontrait, textes en main, que rien ne décèle les progrès de la décadence d'une littérature comme l'abus des formes du langage et les excès de la description pittoresque. Mais jusqu'à *Volupté* les divergences d'opinion n'empêchèrent pas la bienveillance d'exister entre les deux hommes, tous deux enfin collaborateurs littéraires au *National*. Nous nous réservons de traiter les rapports de Nisard et de Sainte-Beuve dans un travail beaucoup plus complet, en préparation.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Portr. Cont.* (1869), I, 137, note (1), app. à l'art. Béranger. *Ibid.*, II, 46, app. à l'art. Ballanche.

<sup>16</sup> Chronique litt., 15 févr. 1833 (*Prem. Lundis*, 1883, p. 159, 162). La lettre que Bastide et Raspail lui envoyèrent au nom des "hommes de coeur" (*Portr. Cont.*, 1869, II, p. 47), est peut-être un rappel d'un passage de l'article du 4 février 1833 sur Carrel, au sujet de son duel avec Laborie. Sainte-Beuve avait écrit: "Pour ceux qui connaissent son caractère de droiture et de franchise . . . , ceux qui, etc. . . . , les hommes de coeur enfin" (*Prem. Lundis*, 1883, III, 365).

Carrel, consulté donc par Nisard, ne lui permit pas l'hésitation "voyant qu'il s'agissait de beaucoup de travail, d'un enseignement très sérieux devant des auditeurs difficiles, d'un traitement<sup>17</sup> à peine égal à celui d'un bon ouvrier dans l'article Paris." Guizot, cette fois du moins, dit-il, "ne méritera pas le reproche d'avoir voulu amortir un journaliste." Et, dit Nisard, *il se chargea* de faire approuver la chose par ses lecteurs. Dans le numéro du 1<sup>o</sup> décembre, à l'endroit même où les plus violentes vitupérations auraient accueilli sa nomination, Sainte-Beuve put lire une eulogie de son rival, de la plume de celui dont il n'avait pu obtenir un mot de justice.

La chronologie du récit de Nisard devient tout à fait incohérente, au moment précis où il nous donne la clé de l'insuccès inexplicable de Sainte-Beuve. Inexplicable: Ampère, malgré ses répugnances, n'avait-il pas accepté (21 sept.), afin d'accommoder tout le monde, de reprendre pour un an encore son enseignement à l'Ecole Normale? Ayant passé de Florence à Rome, il reprit en novembre le chemin du retour. Dès le mois d'octobre, tout semblait avoir été réglé. Pourquoi Nisard fut-il nommé en décembre?

Jusqu'ici, les biographes, négligeant Nisard, répondaient: Sainte-Beuve n'avait pas un caractère commode; il perdit l'Ecole Normale par impatience.<sup>18</sup> On va voir dans un instant que l'impatience ne faisait rien à l'affaire. Mais voici comment, je crois, la légende s'est créée.<sup>19</sup> Mme Lenormant dépouillait la correspondance de Mme Récamier et d'Ampère; après la lettre du 21 septembre, à elle-même adressée,<sup>20</sup> elle ne trouvait plus qu'une seule allusion, insignifiante, à la "négociation pour M. Sainte-Beuve," dans une lettre de Mme Récamier, du 15 octobre. Cependant elle

<sup>17</sup> 2500 fr.: *Souv. et Notes biogr.*, I, 11.

<sup>18</sup> C'est la thèse de tous les biographes d'Ampère, de Mme Récamier et de Sainte-Beuve, à deux exceptions près. Michaut, généralement bien informé, dans *Sainte-Beuve avant les Lundis* (1903) comme dans *Sainte-Beuve* (Les Gds. Ecr. fr.) (1921), suit la documentation Lenormant, mais passe sous silence l'impatience de Sainte-Beuve, comme s'il n'y croyait pas. L. de Launay, dans *Un Amoureux de Mme Récamier. Le Journal de J.-J. Ampère* (1927) a donné enfin correct des faits, mais en courant, et seulement dans la mesure où ils intéressaient Ampère.

<sup>19</sup> Il ne s'agit pas de nier que Sainte-Beuve ait été impatient (voir plus bas, le billet de Guizot), mais que cela ait eu une influence décisive sur sa candidature.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. note 4.



conservait, dans ses propres papiers, un billet de Guizot, non daté,<sup>21</sup> qui se rapportait à l'affaire. Elle le publia entre les deux lettres que je viens de mentionner, avec un mot de remarque :

Voulez-vous, madame,<sup>22</sup> dire à M. Sainte-Beuve de venir me voir après-demain entre onze heures et midi? Je causerai avec lui de mon mieux; et puis, s'il n'accepte pas ma bienveillance, j'accepterai son humeur.

Mille tendres respects

Guizot.

L'irascible et spirituel critique aima mieux renoncer à la chaire que de consentir à l'attendre six mois. Ampère donna sa démission et se consacra . . . à son auditoire du Collège de France. . . .<sup>23</sup>

Pour d'Haussonville, ce billet représente toute l'affaire. Il déclare que "ce fut Sainte-Beuve qui refusa" d'écouter Guizot. Qu'en sait-il? Rien, je le crains, sauf la déduction imprudente qu'il tire d'une phrase de Mme Lenormant, laquelle est fausse. Sainte-Beuve ne renonça nullement à sa chaire: elle lui échappa; et quand elle fut perdue pour lui, il écouta Guizot et accepta sa bienveillance. Certaines raisons étaient plus fortes que son humeur.

Nisard raconte qu'entre le 1<sup>o</sup> décembre (date de la note de Carrel sur sa nomination) et son entrée en fonction (dans la seconde quinzaine de décembre), il se produisit "un incident assez

<sup>21</sup> L'ordre de publication de Mme Lenormant ne crée qu'une présomption, assez peu solide, puisqu'elle avait oublié le reste de l'affaire et l'imagina à la vue de ce billet. Deux dates s'offrent avec une plausibilité égale. Guizot aurait demandé Sainte-Beuve, après avoir fait transmettre à Ampère la proposition de continuer une année encore; donc, au début de septembre. (Serait-ce le 3 septembre? Guizot s'était exprimé nettement sur le compte de Sainte-Beuve avec Cousin, Villemain, Vitet et Mme Lenormant. Sainte-Beuve put s'en fâcher. Il écrivit à Ampère, le 5 septembre: "J'ai vu Guizot. . . . Avec moi, il a été plus accommodant, très poli et obligeant.") Ou bien Guizot aurait écrit après l'échec définitif, en décembre. Voir à la fin de cet article comment Guizot entendait manifester sa bienveillance.

<sup>22</sup> D'Haussonville, *Sainte-Beuve* (Les Gds Ecriv. fr.), 1875, p. 94, se figure que le billet est adressé à Mme Récamier, qui évita soigneusement de se mêler aux négociations (voir sa lettre du 15 août, à Ampère, *Mme Récamier et les Amis de sa Jeunesse*, p. 295). C'est évidemment Mme Lenormant qui devait se charger de convoquer Sainte-Beuve.

<sup>23</sup> *Mme Récamier et les Amis de sa Jeunesse*, p. 294.

plaisant." Guizot, cédant devant la résistance d'Ampère, avait dû avouer à Nisard qu'il lui avait offert une place qui n'était pas libre.

Les choses en étaient là quand le cabinet dont il était membre fut remplacé par le ministère dit des "trois jours."<sup>34</sup> M. Teste y succédait à M. Guizot. Ampère, qui revenait d'un voyage en Italie, en reçut la nouvelle à Marseille. Le nouveau cabinet ne lui plaisait pas. Il en voulut faire sa cour à Guizot, et, prenant la plume, il adressa au nouveau ministre sa démission, cette fois sans condition. Tandis que sa lettre était en chemin, un revirement rappelait aux affaires les ministres sortants, et la démission, adressée à M. Teste, tombait aux mains de M. Guizot, réintégré.

Le jour même il m'écrivit qu'il m'attendait. "La conférence de littérature française est libre cette fois pour de bon, me dit-il; je suis heureux de pouvoir vous l'offrir de nouveau. Mais j'y mets à mon tour une condition; c'est que vous commenciez tout de suite et que vous permettiez à mon fils de suivre vos leçons." Je fis ce qu'il désirait. . . .<sup>35</sup>

Ce fut, en effet, par ce tour digne du vaudeville, que la candidature de Sainte-Beuve échoua. Seulement cet incident plaisant s'était produit *un mois plus tôt!* Le 17 novembre, Ampère, de Marseille, où il venait d'arriver, avertissait Mme Récamier qu'il envoyait sa démission "sans entrer dans aucune explication." Ses motifs, il les lui exposait et annonçait qu'il rentrait incontinent en Italie, avec Rome pour destination dernière. Il terminait sur ces mots:

<sup>34</sup> Le ministère présidé par le vieux duc de Bassano. On ne trouvait pas de premier ministre pour remplacer le maréchal Gérard. Les ministres, Thiers et Guizot en tête, assurés de la pénurie d'hommes, démissionnèrent le 5 novembre afin de forcer le Tiers-Parti, à la tête duquel était Dupin l'aîné, à former un cabinet. Ils se préparèrent à rire. Le Tiers-Parti était la masse encombrante, raisonneuse et bruyante des bourgeois dont le cens faisait tout le mérite politique. Le ministère Bassano exista du 11 novembre au 14, et se couvrit de ridicule. Dès le deuxième jour, voyant la pile des démissions grossir toujours, les ministres y joignirent la leur, sans même avertir leur chef. Le 14, au soir, les journaux annonçaient la dissolution du ministère, et le 18 l'ancien cabinet reprenait sa place, avec le maréchal Mortier au fauteuil (Il devait périr l'année suivante sous la machine infernale de Fieschi). La déconsidération à laquelle on avait exposé le gouvernement, rejaillit sur le régime. C'était, sauf erreur, la première fois que la France, en pleine tranquillité, se voyait sans gouvernement.

<sup>35</sup> *Souv. et Notes biog.*, I, p. 14-15.

Pour Sainte-Beuve, si M. Sauzet est nommé,<sup>26</sup> il aura Lamartine.<sup>27</sup> Je regrette bien de n'avoir pas pu, aux dépens de son repos d'un an, assurer celui de son avenir.<sup>28</sup>

L'erreur de Nisard est plus sérieuse qu'une simple méprise de date. Passons sur le rôle qu'il fait jouer à Guizot. A l'en croire, le *National*, journal d'opposition violente, aurait annoncé la nomination d'une de ses rédacteurs à une place gouvernementale avant que celle-ci fût même vacante ! C'est absurde. Néanmoins, deux jours après nous voyons que les *Débats* félicitent encore Nisard ; puis c'est le tour de la *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Non, n'en doutons plus, Nisard était bel et bien dûment nommé. Mais ici un petit mystère se découvre.

Nisard, en écrivant ses souvenirs, a dû s'aider de la lecture de quelques documents. Pour le récit de "l'incident assez plaisant," il a dû en avoir deux, particuliers, sous les yeux : la *Correspondance* des Ampère, publiée en 1875 (Nisard y apprit qu'Ampère reçut la nouvelle du ministère des trois jours à Marseille) et la *Correspondance* de Sainte-Beuve, en deux volumes, publiée en 1877. La lettre XIV de cette dernière collection est la reproduction littérale d'une lettre de Sainte-Beuve à Ampère que la *Correspondance* des Ampère avait publiée la première<sup>29</sup> avec la date suivante ; *Paris*,

<sup>26</sup> Teste, ministre du Commerce, s'était borné à l'intérim de l'Instruction publique. Le titulaire était Sauzet : il ne fut ministre que dans la chaise qui l'amenait en hâte de Lyon.

<sup>27</sup> Cette phrase est une énigme.

<sup>28</sup> *Corr.* des Ampère, II, p. 66.

<sup>29</sup> P. 67-69. Reproduite dans la *Corr.* de Sainte-Beuve, I, 28-30. Cette lettre est constamment citée pour souligner deux faits : 1. la première mention de *Port-Royal* de la main de Sainte-Beuve ; 2. son assiduité à l'Abbaye-aux-Bois : "Je vais à l'Abbaye deux ou trois fois par semaine" dit-il à Ampère. On a souvent cru que c'était la preuve pour ainsi dire numérique d'une intimité remarquable dans ces années-là entre Sainte-Beuve et le monde de Chateaubriand. J'offre mes suppositions pour ce qu'elles valent. Je crois que le soin de sa candidature explique en grande partie cette assiduité, qui n'a dû se manifester que pendant une courte période, après le retour de Mme Récamier de Clamart. Après l'échec (dont la date coïncide avec la reprise des lectures des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*), on a lieu de croire que Sainte-Beuve se fit rare, très rare. C'était son genre ("Savez-vous, mon ami, que vous êtes un *singulier pistolet* ?" lui écrivait G. Sand, en juillet 1833. Je vous ai laissé opérer votre *éclipse*,

18 décembre 1834. Non seulement Nisard a accepté cette date sans défiance, mais il a essayé d'y plier les faits. Feuilletant la *Correspondance* de Sainte-Beuve, il était tombé, un peu plus haut, sur la lettre du 5 septembre adressée à Ampère, et elle lui avait remis en mémoire ce détail que Guizot tenait à faire suivre la conférence de français à son fils aîné. Voilà la source de la jolie phrase de Guizot, dans les "Souvenirs" de Nisard: "... Mais j'y mets à mon tour une condition: c'est que vous *commenciez tout de suite*<sup>30</sup> et que vous permettiez à mon fils..." Ces aimables propos, eussent-ils été prêtés à Guizot, sous cette forme, si la date de la lettre de Sainte-Beuve avait été plus ancienne que Nisard ne le croyait? S'il y avait eu trois semaines, par exemple entre la nomination de Nisard et son entrée en fonction, le ministre l'aurait-il prié de commencer *tout de suite ses leçons*?

L'erreur de date est patente. Le second éditeur de la lettre de Sainte-Beuve semble confirmer le premier parce qu'il le copie sans critique. Il faut ramener cette lettre à sa date probable par les échelons suivants.

On va nommer à l'Ecole aujourd'hui ou demain, écrit Sainte-Beuve, et

---

mais voilà, je crois, un mois que cela dure..." G. Sand, *Lettres à Musset et à Sainte-Beuve*, 1897, p. 116). Il est remarquable de constater que Mme Lenormant, dans les *Souvenirs et Correspondance de Mme Récamier* (1859), pour les "premières années qui suivirent la révolution de Juillet" (5<sup>e</sup> éd., p. 486), ayant à mentionner Sainte-Beuve, encore vivant à cette date, n'ait retenu que ce détail, dont elle profita pour donner au critique une légère leçon de civilité: "... Vous le voyez souvent, vous vous flattez qu'il y trouve lui-même quelque plaisir; mais tout à coup, vous le perdez, il vous échappe (*Cela dut frapper Mme Lenormant, car, après tout, elle avait travaillé pour lui*). Quoiqu'il en soit, l'époque dont je m'occupe est une de celles où M. Sainte-Beuve vint le plus assidûment à l'Abbaye-aux-Bois" (p. 492). J'admire la mansuétude du poète, je veux dire Sainte-Beuve, qui put laisser croire à Mme Lenormant qu'il se plaisait à son commerce, maintenant que je sais que cette dame a toujours cru que *Volupté* n'était pas un livre sérieux! Voir dans Ch. Maurras, *Trois idées politiques (Romantisme et Révolution*, éd. déf. 1922, p. 256) une page admirable sur la signification des fuites de Sainte-Beuve quand elles étaient définitives.

<sup>30</sup> C'est moi qui souligne: en effet, du 18 décembre à la rentrée, il n'y aurait eu que quelques jours.

je crains presque, si je suis nommé,<sup>31</sup> d'être détourné de cette cellule que je me creusais pour l'année.<sup>32</sup>

La nomination de Nisard (voir plus haut) était de notoriété publique dès le 1<sup>o</sup> décembre.—La lettre mentionne la candidature de Scribe à l'Académie, contra Ballanche:<sup>33</sup> Scribe fut élu le 27 novembre.—Enfin, la date est bien indiquée, sinon précisée, au début:

Nous recevons vos lettres au moment où un nouveau revirement ici a remplacé le ministère et ses hommes au même point que devant; mais vous ne deviez rien prévoir de la comédie de cette *semaine des dupes*<sup>34</sup> et vous avez bien fait de retourner à cette Rome éternelle . . . etc.

C'est le 18 novembre, à trois heures, que le Roi signa les ordonnances. Les journaux du soir publièrent la nouvelle. Sainte-Beuve n'a pas pu écrire avant de les avoir lus. La lettre a donc été écrite avant le 27 novembre et pas plus tôt que le soir du 18: cette dernière date est la plus probable. Sainte-Beuve avait hâte d'avertir Ampère et de prévenir toute décision brusque de sa part.<sup>35</sup> L'édi-

<sup>31</sup> Il est étrange que Sainte-Beuve se crût encore un candidat possible, puisque Ampère avait accepté de continuer une année de plus. Avait-on travaillé Guizot au point d'espérer un changement d'attitude? Les conventions passées avec Mme Lenormant n'avaient qu'un caractère préliminaire. Sainte-Beuve parle ici de l'acte officiel. Peut-être la question posée offrait-elle une alternative, qui allait être tranchée: soit conserver Ampère, à des conditions nouvelles que celui-ci avait acceptées; soit prendre Sainte-Beuve à sa place. Ce dernier se croyait, en tout cas, une chance (au moins théorique) de succès.

<sup>32</sup> Cette "cellule," c'était l'étude de *Port-Royal*.

<sup>33</sup> La candidature de Ballanche, surgie après celle de Sainte-Beuve tint l'Abbaye très occupée cet automne-là. Un familier, A. Barbier, l'auteur des *Iambes*, les a confondues dans ses *Souvenirs* (1883). Il prétend qu'en 1834 Sainte-Beuve s'assurait l'appui de Mme Récamier parce qu'il songeait à entrer à l'Académie! (p. 315, 322). Il avait bien assez de peine à entrer à l'Ecole Normale! Il ne passait alors que pour un poète littéraire: c'est comme critique qu'il entra à l'Académie, dix ans plus tard. Il y fallut ce *Port-Royal* que Guizot lui réclamait pour établir ses droits universitaires *aux yeux de tous*. La lecture du 1<sup>o</sup> volume, en 1839, dans le salon de Mme Récamier, posa sa véritable candidature (J. Turquan, *Mme Récamier*, p. 411). L'échec des deux candidatures de l'Abbaye en 1834, fortifia la confusion dans la mémoire de Barbier.

<sup>34</sup> Doudan fit circuler dans le cercle des de Broglie un mot bien plus joli: la *journée des Dupins* (*Lettres*, 1883, I, 33).

<sup>35</sup> Il savait qu'Ampère faisait un gros sacrifice en sa faveur, en acceptant

teur de la *Correspondance* des Ampère, Mme H. C. déroutée peut-être par les pattes de mouches de Sainte-Beuve ou par les cachets illisibles de la poste, s'est laissée guider, je pense, par l'allusion au retour à Rome. C'est la faute de Sainte-Beuve; sa phrase est emberlificotée en grande partie par un effort maladroit pour cacher à Ampère l'importance qu'avaient pour lui les événements et de garder l'attitude de poète nonchalant qu'il avait prise vis-à-vis de son ami. Mais il doit s'agir d'une visite à Rome faite *avant* le retour à Marseille. Le 18 décembre eût été une mauvaise date de toute façon. Ampère, ce jour-là, n'était nullement de retour à Rome. Il avait fait naufrage sur la côte de Toscane, et subissait, sous bonne garde, une quarantaine réglementaire contre le choléra. Libéré, il accourut le 24 décembre à Livourne, plein d'angoisse, cherchant à savoir s'il serait possible à son courrier d'arriver à temps à Paris pour rassurer ses amis. Le consul le calma. Ampère ne semble pas l'avoir reconnu. C'était Stendhal.

Et le petit mystère? Nisard a donc utilisé pour un chapitre de "souvenirs" écrit en 1870 des documents qui n'ont paru qu'en 1875 et 1877. Il est hautement improbable qu'on lui les ait communiqués en manuscrit. Texte en main, on acceptera peut-être ma conclusion. Le chapitre s'est d'abord arrêté sur la note de Carrel; il contient vraiment des souvenirs rédigés en 1870. Mais, plus tard, travaillé du souci de se justifier, surtout contre feu Sainte-Beuve qui avait traversé sa vie comme un mauvais génie, Nisard ajouta un post-scriptum habile que lui suggéraient des lectures récentes. La date: 1870, ne demande qu'à être glissée à sa place, entre la note du *National* et le récit de "l'incident assez plaisant."

Nisard avait son intention en composant le post-scriptum. Reprenons le texte. (Guizot a dû annoncer à Nisard que la place n'était pas libre.)

A ce moment je me représentai les difficultés auxquelles j'échappais, et la douceur de reprendre mon indépendance, et je parus plutôt soulagé que désappointé. M. Guizot voulut bien me témoigner quelque peine de

---

de reprendre la conférence, et qu'il se demandait d'ailleurs si ce sacrifice en valait la peine. Voir sa lettre à Mme Récamier, du 21 sept. (cf. note 4): "Si du moins j'étais parfaitement sûr que ce supplice prolongé mènera à quelque chose. Mais plus tard M. Guizot sera-t-il ministre? Le livre de Sainte-Beuve sera-t-il fait? etc."



ce contre-temps; je me donnai le plaisir de le consoler. Il alla plus loin; il parla de dédommagement, et il m'offrit de m'attacher à la publication des *Documents relatifs à l'histoire de France*. Rien dans les travaux qui avaient appelé quelque attention sur moi ne préparait le public à me voir tout à coup marcher sur les brisées des élèves de l'Ecole des Chartes. J'en fis la remarque à M. Guizot; il n'insista pas.<sup>36</sup>

Scène élégante, touchante, édifiante même; scène plausible aussi. Elle évoque une autre scène dont Sainte-Beuve ne nous a pas laissés de souvenirs et où il dut entendre des paroles semblables de Guizot. Ce fut après la nomination de Nisard. Le dépit de Sainte-Beuve était grand. Le *National*, Nisard, Guizot, Ampère même, tout le monde était satisfait à ses dépens. On n'a jamais bien expliqué pourquoi Sainte-Beuve devint secrétaire du Comité des Travaux historiques et écrivit des mémoires pour Guizot, sous la signature duquel l'un d'eux fut publié. Il affecta toujours de la désinvolture à propos de cet emploi. En 1835, il se plaignait du temps qu'il y perdait. Pourquoi l'avait-il pris? Pour faire la nique à Carrel et au *National*, je le crains.

Seulement, si Sainte-Beuve souscrivit aux propositions bienveillantes du ministre, celui-ci n'eut pas l'heur d'entendre une seconde fois les belles raisons probantes qui lui avaient fermé la bouche devant l'autre candidat. C'est le fin du fin. Nisard aurait pu se contenter de nous faire savoir que Sainte-Beuve, le grand Sainte-Beuve, avait accepté autrefois, avec empressement, ce que lui, Nisard, avait préféré laisser pour compte au ministre. Mais Nisard cherchait une satisfaction plus subtile. Et il donna une *leçon de conduite POSTHUME* à Sainte-Beuve! Voilà ce qu'il aurait dû dire, et voilà ce qu'il n'a pas dit!

Sainte-Beuve n'avait pas attendu si longtemps pour faire sentir sa griffe à Nisard. Au bout de deux ans, en 1836, il le prit à partie dans une étude impitoyable, insérée par la *Revue des Deux Mondes*.<sup>37</sup> Michaut<sup>38</sup> reconnaît que Sainte-Beuve avait des rancunes personnelles à exercer sur Nisard. Mais il ne relève que celles sur lesquelles Sainte-Beuve a bien voulu s'exprimer, et son analyse se termine sur ces mots:

<sup>36</sup> *Souv. et Notes biogr.*, II, 14.

<sup>37</sup> 4<sup>e</sup> série, t. VIII, 1<sup>er</sup> nov. 1836, p. 270-286.

<sup>38</sup> *Sainte-Beuve avant les Lundis*, p. 342.

'Critique régulier et restrictif,' il sera (Sainte-Beuve le dit avec assez de netteté, en terminant) non pas un vrai critique, mais un simple pédagogue.

Michaut tombe fort juste. La conclusion est claire. Mais si Sainte-Beuve exprima son idée avec "assez de netteté," il se garda bien de la formuler. Il était trop fin pour rien écrire qui rappelât le candidat évincé dans une affaire que l'on oubliait déjà.

MARC DENKINGER

*University of Buffalo*

---

#### GOLDSMITH AND THE PRESENT STATE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

In the *London Mercury* for October, 1924,<sup>1</sup> Mr. Iolo Williams supplements his previously published bibliography of Oliver Goldsmith<sup>2</sup> by a discussion and a bibliographical description of a work entitled the *Present State of the British Empire in Europe, America, Africa and Asia*, published by a group of booksellers in 1768.<sup>3</sup> The present paper, besides furnishing one more example of eighteenth-century book-making methods, will, I think, establish even more firmly the attribution of this work to Goldsmith.

Some hundred pages of the *Present State*—the section devoted to a description of the British Empire in America—are transferred almost without change from Burke's<sup>4</sup> *Account of the European Settlements in America*, first published in 1757.<sup>5</sup> The borrowings may be listed as follows:

<sup>1</sup> X, 637-38.

<sup>2</sup> *Seven XVIIIth Century Bibliographies*, pp. 117-77.

<sup>3</sup> These were W. Griffin, J. Johnson, W. Nicoll, and Richardson and Urquhart. The work is advertised in the *London Chronicle* and *Lloyd's Evening Post* for May 11, 1768.

<sup>4</sup> Both Edmund and William Burke are supposed to have been concerned in this work.

<sup>5</sup> In the copy I have used the first volume is of the second edition (1758) and the second volume of the third edition (1760).

*Present State**Account*

pp. 257-59

I, 203-08, Chapter I of Part III. the chapter heading being *A General Description of America*.

pp. 259-76

I, 167-201, comprising Part II, on *The Manners of the Americans*.<sup>6</sup>

pp. 276-87

II, 60-84, a portion of Part VI, *The English Settlements*.

pp. 287-346

II, 173-292, including a large section of Part VII, on *British North America*.

pp. 346-50

II, 25-34, Chapter IV of Part V, *The French Settlements*.

An example of the use the author made of his source is afforded by a comparison of the following passages in which the town of Louisburg is described. It will be remembered that between 1757 and 1768 Louisburg had passed from French to English hands, and the italics will show that the transference of territory caused less trouble to the compiler than to the high contracting parties:

*Account*

The only town in this island [Cape Breton] is Louisbourg. It stands upon one of the finest harbours in all America. This harbour is four leagues in circumference, landlocked every way but at the mouth, which is narrow; and within there is fine anchorage every where in seven fathom water. The town itself is of a tolerable size, and well built and fortified. *The harbour is defended by batteries of cannon and forts, which secure it at this day, perhaps too effectually.* This harbour is open the whole year. The French ships that carry goods to Quebec can very seldom get their full loading there, therefore on their return they put into Louisbourg, and there take in a quantity of fish, coal, and some lumber, and then sail away to the French islands in the West-Indies, where they vend these, and soon compleat their cargo with sugars. It is needless to observe that this island was taken by us in the late war, but restored by the treaty of Aix la Chapelle, in which we certainly were not in such a condition as to entitle us to prescribe the terms.<sup>7</sup>

*Present State*

The only town in this island *was* Louisbourg *now* an heap of ruins. It stood upon one of the finest harbours in all America. This harbour is four leagues in circumference, landlocked every way but at the mouth, which

<sup>6</sup> This section contains one of the most nauseating descriptions of Indian torture I have ever seen. It may be compared with the experiences of Lismahago in *Humphry Clinker*.

<sup>7</sup> II, 34.

is narrow; and within there is fine anchorage every where in seven fathom water. The town itself *was* of a tolerable size, and well built and fortified. [ ] The harbour is open the whole year. The French ships that *carried* goods to Quebec very seldom *got* their full loading there; therefore on their return they put into Louisbourg, and there *took* in a quantity of fish, coal, and some lumber, and then *sailed* away to the French islands in the West-Indies, where they *vended* these, and soon *compleated* their cargo with sugars. It is needless to observe that this island was taken by us in the late war, and *finally ceded to us by the last treaty of peace.*<sup>9</sup>

Such literary piracy differs from Goldsmith's usual method in his hack-work<sup>9</sup> chiefly perhaps in the extent to which it is here carried. In the *Present State* even the shuffling of the parts seems to have cost very little effort. At one point the author concludes a paragraph on Jamaica as follows:

But of the government I shall say little, until I speak of the government of the rest of the plantations, to which this is in all respects alike.<sup>10</sup>

He then proceeds with the next paragraph, ostensibly still on the subject of Jamaica:

The commodities which the country yields are principally mast, and yards, for which they contract largely with the royal navy; pitch tar, and turpentine; . . . Indian corn and pease; . . . They have a very noble cod fishery upon their coast, which employs a vast number of their people. . . .

The explanation of cod fisheries in Jamaica lies in the author's having suddenly skipped over eighty-nine pages of his source,<sup>11</sup> and without a hint of any break in the context, having listed as the products of Jamaica those which Burke assigns to New England. Well might the critic in the *Monthly Review* complain, "The accounts of our American settlements are confusedly given."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Pp. 349-50. A few similar changes occur elsewhere. Thus a concluding paragraph is added to the account of Hudson's Bay (cf. p. 346 and *Account*, II, 292, 25). Alterations like those above occur at page 346 (cf. *Account*, II, 25) and 348 (cf. *ibid.*, II, 30).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. R. W. Chapman and R. S. Crane, *TLS.*, June 13, 1929, p. 474; C. F. Tupper, *MLN.*, XLV (February, 1930), 71-77; and Prior, *Life of Oliver Goldsmith* (1837), II, 436.

<sup>11</sup> P. 287.

<sup>12</sup> See *Account*, II, 84, 173.

<sup>13</sup> *Monthly Review*, XXXIX (November, 1768), 405-07.

This reviewer has pointed out shortcomings elsewhere in the book as it finally appeared, for he remarks that the author

in his preface, refers his readers to a map, as the easier information [upon topographical matters]; would not the reader then expect a map, or rather maps, for him to consult? no one however was to be found in the copy we purchased, nor does the title (and titles seldom omit the mention of such appendages) promise any. Again, he observes, p. 8. on another reference to the map, to excuse the mention of the boundaries and extent of the countries, 'we are resolved at all times to sacrifice method to perspicuity, and avail ourselves of those advantages that serve to lessen the reader's labour, as well as our own.'<sup>13</sup>

That this sacrificing method might lessen the labour, he was easily perhaps convinced; but that it would tend to perspicuity, or lessen the labour of his readers, if they read for information, may not be quite so evident to others. . . . In brief, this volume appears altogether to be a hasty, injudicious piece of manufacture.

The foregoing evidence should go far towards removing the difficulty which Mr. Williams sees in the fact that in 1767, when he had become famous, Goldsmith seems to have received only ten pounds for writing or compiling a work of four hundred and eighty-six pages.<sup>14</sup> If, as we may suppose, the rest of the work was clipped and pasted in the same fashion as the section on America, ten pounds was high pay for such a compilation. Whether, as Mr. Williams suggests, Goldsmith merely supervised the work, I know no means of determining. The text certainly shows no very clear trace of his hand. That this work, however, is the *Present State* for which Goldsmith received ten pounds from Newbery in 1767, there can be no reasonable doubt. In support of the attribution we have not only the Newbery memorandum, dated some ten months before the work finally appeared,<sup>15</sup> and the evidence advanced by Mr. Williams, but also the testimony of an

<sup>13</sup> This sentence is nearer to the style and sentiment of Goldsmith than perhaps any other in the book. It is obvious that the publishers who secured the book from Newbery contributed, by omitting the maps, to the general chaos of the work.

<sup>14</sup> See the *London Mercury*, X (October, 1924), 637-38.

<sup>15</sup> See Prior, *op. cit.*, II, 155. The entry is dated July 13, 1767. The attribution of the work to J. Goldsmith (see Sabin, *Bibliotheca Americana*) can hardly be correct. "J. Goldsmith" seems to have been the pseudonym of Sir Richard Phillips, writer, among other things, of school books, who was not born until 1767.

apparently well informed contemporary. An anonymous detractor in the *London Packet* for March 31-April 2, 1773, in discussing some of Goldsmith's works which he regards as "no objects for pomposity," charges him with having "extracted a Present State of the British Empire."

R. W. SEITZ

*University of Buffalo*

### TRUTH AND FICTION IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY NEWSPAPERS

Professor Frederick Pottle has recently called attention to the probable unreliability of eighteenth-century newspapers as sources of information concerning persons and events, both in England and abroad.<sup>1</sup> Interesting confirmation of his doubts is to be found in two dramatic pieces of the 1770's—Samuel Foote's *Bankrupt*<sup>2</sup> and Arthur Murphy's *News from Parnassus*.<sup>3</sup>

The nearest Foote ever came to sentimental comedy was when he thus dramatized the distress of Lydia Riscounter, who came near ruin through the machinations of a step-mother who inserted a false and scandalous paragraph about her in one of the newspapers edited by Matthew Margin. Margin is shown (III, ii) in conference with his assistants. Roger Rumour and Phelim O'Flam collect paragraphs. Pepper and Plaster are the political writers, pro and con, writing on opposite sides in alternate years. Fibber and Forge'em devote their time to the composition of paragraphs to supplement those which Rumour and O'Flam bring in. Rumour brings in a false paragraph on European political entanglements, and another on city politics. Then enters Sir Thomas Tradewell, who has come to deny that he is dead, as O'Flam had reported, and Sir Riscounter, who seeks revenge for the slander of his daughter, Lydia. Margin is quite willing to publish paragraphs

<sup>1</sup> In a paper on "Boswell and 18th Century Journalism", read before the English VIII Section of the Modern Language Association, on December 31, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> First played at the Haymarket, July 21, 1773; published in 1776.

<sup>3</sup> Performed as an "introductory piece" at the opening of Covent Garden Theatre, September 23, 1776; first published in Murphy's *Works*, London, 1786, iv, 389-424.



of denial, for they too fill space and make more news! But he continues his trade unreformed. It should be noted that this play was written and acted before Foote had suffered so severely from the scandalous paragraphs in Jackson's *Public Ledger*.

Murphy's satiric piece is even more to the point. He had edited a periodical some twenty-five years earlier,<sup>4</sup> and had had a busy career as an actor, lawyer, dramatist, essayist, and reviewer. No man of his time was more familiar with the practices of publishers and their hacks.

To the apartment of Boccacini, a visiting foreign critic, said to have "news from Parnassus", comes Vellum, a bookseller, of whom Boccacini makes inquiries concerning his profession.

*Boccacini.* You print a newspaper?

*Vellum.* I do, Sir.

*Boccacini.* A newspaper is an extraordinary manufacture, but I can form no idea of the process. Bees make wax; worms produce silk; and spiders weave their webs: but what kind of animals engender a newspaper is beyond my skill.

*Vellum.* You foreigners know nothing of the matter: we owe it all to liberty. How do you think it is done?

*Boccacini.* News from all parts of the kingdom! private intelligence from families! accounts from every quarter of the globe! I suppose to do all this, you have correspondents abroad, who may be depended upon. If a sudden event happens in a private family, they to be sure give you notice.

*Vellum.* Not a tittle of this. A printing house is like a bee-hive: some drones are there; the busy fly and buzz abroad in the morning, and return loaded at noon: but they never bring enough; we supply the rest. Troops in America! a letter from thence is writ in my garret. We have in the Merchants Directory, a full list of all the principal names in the city. Now in a dearth of news, we send half a score to Tunbridge, another flight to Margate; a third group to Brighthelmstone. We rob this man on the highway; we kill another at a city feast; and we stop payment for a great house, just as we like.

*Boccacini.* And all false?

*Vellum.* Every syllable. At the St. James's end of the town, we used to be hard put to it: but difficulties are now removed; their names are all on the street doors; we take them down in our list, and then deal with them as we like. We ruin the eldest son at play, and sometimes shoot him: we ravish the daughter, put the mother to bed with the coachman, hang the father up in the stable, and make a Lord steal half a dozen tea-spoons out of a silver-smith's shop.

---

<sup>4</sup>*The Gray's-Inn Journal*, published weekly, October, 1752, to October, 1754.

*Boccalini.* Don't you observe some degree of probability in your stories?

*Vellum.* Oh! no; the incredible goes down best in this country.

*Boccalini.* But won't the falsehood be found out?

*Vellum.* After some noise; our end is answered first. A newspaper, Sir, is a great school of science: most of the modern authors have never been at any other. With a good genius for lying, a tolerable stock of malice, a store of envy, and not a grain of literature, they write in the Journals, for three or four years; then set up for men of great talents, and from their garrets, or the Fleet, come forth novels, histories, plays, essays upon spirit and matter, whole reams in praise of themselves, and a torrent of abuse against every species of merit.

*Boccalini.* But the plough is defrauded by this.

*Vellum.* That may be: the staining of paper is our object. Now to give you a true idea of the matter; no man can go out of town; or stay at home; or pay his tradesmen, or not pay 'em; live or die, be or not be; marry or continue single; no lady can look handsome, be a good wife, a virtuous daughter, or an affectionate mother, but we in our paper turn all topsey turvey, right or wrong, true or false, no matter for that; we kill the living, bring the dead to life, and represent life just as we please.

J. HOMER CASKEY

*Ohio University*

#### BURNS AND HUGH BLAIR

That Hugh Blair, Professor of Rhetoric in Edinburgh University, took considerable interest in Burns during the poet's first sojourn in Edinburgh has long been known, but the actual records of his interest have consisted mainly of Burns's not-too-flattering characterization of the Doctor in the Edinburgh Commonplace Book, his letter of thanks and farewell on leaving the city in May, 1787, together with Blair's pompous and self-approving reply,<sup>1</sup> and two or three anecdotes of which the best-known concerns Blair's emendation of stanza 12 of *The Holy Fair* to read "tidings of damnation" instead of "salvation."

Some inedited memoranda in the Esty Collection<sup>2</sup> not only clearly display Blair's attitude towards Burns and his work, but also confirm the anecdote just mentioned, further illustrate the

<sup>1</sup> See the Chambers-Wallace *Life and Works of Burns*, II, 86 and 97-8.

<sup>2</sup> The splendid collection of Burns MSS formed by Mr. Robert P. and Mrs. Mildred C. Esty of Ardmore, Pa., of whose generosity it is a pleasure once more to make public acknowledgment.

sort of criticism the poet received from the Edinburgh literati, and enable us for the first time to determine the tune and the date of one of his minor songs and to correct a persistent error regarding *The Jolly Beggars*. Most important of all, they name a poem which apparently has been lost—one, at least, which cannot be certainly identified with any extant work.

These memoranda are Blair's comments on the Kilmarnock *Poems* and on the additional material which Burns had offered for possible inclusion in his Edinburgh edition. Twice docketed "Dr Blair" in Burns's hand, they are inserted in Mr. Esty's copy of the Kilmarnock edition—a volume which formerly belonged to the descendants of Gilbert Burns. The following is the complete text, with Blair's page-references to the Kilmarnock *Poems* elucidated in brackets:

Observations on Mr Burn's (*sic*) Poems.

p. 187. [*Dedication to Gavin Hamilton*, line 49.] The line—*And och—that's nae Regen—n*—ought to be omitted (*sic*) as Mr Burns agreed.

p. 188. [*Ibid.*, lines 68 ff.] The Paragraph beginning with this line, *O ye wha leave the springs o' C-lv-n*—had much better I think be omitted. The Poem will be better without it, & it will give offence by the ludicrous views of the punishments of Hell.

p. 200. [*Epistle to John Rankine*, stanzas 7 ff.] The Description of shooting the hen is understood, I find, to convey an indecent meaning: tho' in reading the poem, I confess, I took it literally, and the indecency did not strike me. But if the Author meant to allude to an affair with a Woman, as is supposed, the whole Poem ought undoubtedly to be left out of the new edition.

p. 46. [*The Holy Fair*, stanza 12.] The line—*wi' tidings of Sal-v—n*—ought to be alter'd, as it gives just offence. The Author may easily contrive some other Rhyme in place of the word *Salv—n*.

p. 58. [*Address to the Deil*, stanza 11.] The stanza of—*There mystic knots make great abuse*—had better be left out, as indecent.

p. 85. [*A Dream*, stanza 13.] The stanza—*Young Royal Tarry Breeks, I learn*—is also coarse and had better be omitted.

p. 233. [*Epitaph for Gavin Hamilton*.] The last line—*May I be saved or d—d*—is very exceptionable. The general thought may remain, *may I be with him wherever he is*—but may be d—d with him, is too much, & ought undoubtedly to be altered.

Of the proposed additions to the New Edition some are very good. The best, I think, are—John Barleycorn—Death & Dr Hornbook—The Winter Night—the verses left in a friends house where the Author slept.

There are a few which in my opinion ought not to be published.

The two Stanzas to the tune of Gilliecrankie, which refer to the death

of Zimri and Cozbi as related in the book of Numbers, are beyond doubt, quite inadmissible.

The Verses also entitled *The Prophet and God's Complaint*, from the 15th Ch. of Jeremiah, are also inadmissible. They would be considered burlesquing the Scriptures.

The Whole of What is called the Cantata, the Songs of the Beggars & their Doxies, with the Grace at the end of them, are altogether unfit in my opinion for publication. They are by much too licentious; and fall below the dignity which Mr Burns possesses in the rest of his poems & would rather degrade them.

These observations are Submitted by one who is a great friend to Mr Burn's Poems and wishes him to preserve the fame of *Virtuous Sensibility*, & of humorous fun, without offence.<sup>3</sup>

So far as it concerns the poems which were already in print Blair's criticism is self-explanatory, and is chiefly interesting as a portrayal of the workings of the professorial mind. Of his seven suggestions, Burns accepted only the first and the fourth. With regard to the first, the line to which Blair objected is weak, and the poem was little the worse without it; as for the fourth, the substitution of "damnation" for "salvation" Burns, and all his readers, have agreed was an improvement. These first remarks of Blair's, however, evoke a comment and a question.

It is well known that Burns rejected nearly every change in the *Kilmarnock* text which was suggested to him in Edinburgh—sometimes, as in the case of Mrs. Dunlop's criticisms, at the cost of giving serious offence to the critic.<sup>4</sup> When we add Blair's censures to hers, and reflect that probably everyone who was asked for advice—and doubtless a good many who weren't—offered similar hints, we have sufficient explanation of Burns's refusal to make alterations. To have accepted all the suggestions would have reduced his poems to unrecognizable namby-pamby; to have accepted some and rejected others would have given double offence to the critics who were ignored; the only possible course was the one Burns took—to reject all changes and stand by his printed text.

Though Blair's fourth comment furnishes corroboration from

<sup>3</sup> The text of these notes was included by the present writer in a brief popular article on Burns and Blair published in the *Scotsman* (Edinburgh), 22 Jan., 1930.

<sup>4</sup> *Robert Burns and Mrs. Dunlop*, London, 1898, pp. 11-13 and 21-23.

his own hand of the story that he suggested the change in *The Holy Fair*, it also raises a question. In the face of this note, are we justified in accepting as authentic the form in which the anecdote is usually related?<sup>5</sup> Did Blair first offer the emendation when he and other gentlemen were discussing the poem with Burns, and did Burns embarrass him with the honest but *gauche* request for permission to acknowledge his help in a footnote? Had Blair already made the suggestion orally, it seems likely that here, as in his first comment, he would have referred to the fact in his memorandum, and the episode as related in the biographies can hardly have occurred after the written hint was in Burns's hand. Moreover, the cautious vagueness of the note is scarcely comprehensible if Blair had already, in the presence of witnesses, offered the specific word. In short, we have good reason to suspect that the accepted form of the story is mere Edinburgh gossip so dressing the incident as to portray Burns as an awkward rustic eagerly receiving aid from the polished and urbane professor.

As to the "proposed additions" to the Edinburgh volume, Blair's favorable comments need not detain us, though it is pleasant, and somewhat surprising, to find him commending *John Barleycorn* and *Death and Dr. Hornbook*—the more so as he totally ignores *The Brigs of Ayr*. But three of his rejections merit consideration.

"There is no evidence," says Wallace,<sup>6</sup> "that Burns contemplated giving [*The Jolly Beggars*] to the world. On the contrary, he laid it aside, and in a few years had forgotten its existence. On being reminded of it by George Thomson in 1793, he said . . . :

'I have forgot the cantata you allude to, as I kept no copy, and indeed did not know of its existence; however, I remember that none of the songs pleased myself, except the last, something about—

Courts for cowards were erected,  
Churches built to please the priest.'"

Indeed, Burns's failure to publish the poem has served for more than a century as a stock illustration of the unreliability of poets'

<sup>5</sup> The accepted form of the story apparently derives from Lockhart, who here, as in so many other places, fails to cite any authority for his statements. See his *Life of Burns*, Everyman ed., 94.

<sup>6</sup> Chambers-Wallace: *Life and Works*, I, 245. The full text of Burns's letter to Thomson (Sept., 1793) is given in IV, 44.

judgments of their own verses. But here at last we have proof that Burns—always remarkably clear-eyed as to the merits and defects of himself and his poems—was ready to set *The Jolly Beggars* beside his other work. It may be that others besides Blair condemned it, but in the total absence of other evidence the blame for its non-appearance must rest squarely on Blair's shoulders. Furthermore, we should beware of too sweeping an interpretation of Burns's later disparagement of the poem. He is speaking of the songs as songs; not of the work as a whole. From the point of view of his later mastery of verbal interpretation of Scottish airs, he might well have considered the lyrics crude without thereby condemning the whole work as a dramatic and humorous composition.

A minor question, which Blair's reference is too vague to answer, is the identity of the grace which he mentions in connection with *The Jolly Beggars*. No recorded manuscript of the poem closes thus, and none of Burns's extant graces seems wholly in keeping with the tone of the cantata.

"The two stanzas to the tune of Gilliecrankie" may probably be identified with the song "I murder hate by field or flood," which closes with the lines:

But let me have bold Zimri's fate  
Within the arms of Cozbi.

The measure is the same as that of *The Fête Champetre*, which was avowedly composed to the air of *Killiecrankie*. J. C. Dick said of these stanzas, "The tune is unknown if ever there was one, which is doubtful;"<sup>7</sup> but he included the words in his edition because in the Glenriddell MS they are entitled "A Song." Blair's note not only proves that here, as elsewhere, Burns wrote with a definite tune in mind, but also shows that the lines must have been written at Mossgiel—probably in 1785 or the beginning of 1786—instead of at Dumfries. A comparatively late date has always been taken for granted from the fact that the only extant holograph apart from the Glenriddell MS—itsself completed about 1792—is a copy of the first stanza which the poet inscribed on a window-pane of the Globe Inn. The verses are trivial enough, but it somewhat enhances their interest to learn that they belonged

<sup>7</sup> J. C. Dick: *The Songs of Robert Burns*, London, 1903, 413.



to Burns's apprenticeship in song-writing instead of to the period of his contributions to *The Scots Musical Museum*.

Identification of *The Prophet and God's Complaint* is not so easy. Mr. J. C. Ewing holds<sup>\*</sup> that it is the three stanzas beginning "Ah, woe is me, my mither dear," which are paraphrased from *Jeremiah* XV, 10. This is indubitably an early poem, for one of the three holographs listed by Henley and Henderson<sup>\*</sup> is inscribed in a copy of the 1785 edition of Fergusson's *Poems* which Burns presented to an Edinburgh lady early in 1787. On the basis of differences in the handwriting, the Centenary editors further conclude that these stanzas were written in the book considerably earlier than the lines to Fergusson which accompanied its presentation to the lady. Obviously, therefore, the poem was composed early enough to have been included in the Edinburgh edition.

On the other hand, none of the three known manuscripts bears such a title as *The Prophet and God's Complaint*, nor does that title seem especially appropriate to "Ah, woe is me." In the tenth verse of *Jeremiah* XV the prophet does not appear to be remonstrating with God or answering His complaint: he is lamenting his own fate. But the title quoted by Blair would apply admirably to a paraphrase of other portions of the chapter—verses 1 to 9 and 15 to 18 in particular. Burns had repeatedly proved his ability to make humorous use of Scriptural ideas and phraseology, and it is easy to guess what his lively imagination might have done with some of the promising material in *Jeremiah*. Furthermore, if the biblical reference were omitted from the heading, "Ah, woe is me" would seem too innocuous to shock even the delicate sensibilities of Hugh Blair. Nothing short of the discovery of a manuscript of "Ah, woe is me" bearing this title can make it certain that *The Prophet and God's Complaint* is not a lost poem.

Besides their importance in relation to the particular points just discussed, these notes of Blair's are valuable as an addition to the scanty store of specific first-hand documents illustrating the way in which Burns and his work were received by the polite world of Edinburgh. That world did its best to remold the "Ayr-

<sup>\*</sup> Letter in the *Scotsman*, Edinburgh, 15 March, 1930.

<sup>\*</sup> *The Centenary Burns*, Edinburgh, 1896, II, 410.

shire ploughman" into a "polite" poet. Only the "stubborn, ungainly integrity" of his genius saved Burns from emasculation at the hands of Hugh Blair and his ilk.

J. DELANCEY FERGUSON

*Western Reserve University*

---

### THE ATTACK OF THE LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY UPON ALTERATIONS OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS<sup>1</sup>

Modern scholars have often pointed out the prevalence of adaptation of Shakespeare's plays throughout the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries,<sup>2</sup> but it is not so generally known that as early as 1756 there had set in against these alterations an opposition which mounted steadily throughout the rest of the century. It will be the purpose of this article to suggest this rising distaste of critics for the mangling of Shakespeare during the last four decades of the eighteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This article has nothing to do with travesties upon or operas from Shakespeare's plays.

<sup>2</sup> See H. B. Wheatley, "Post Restoration Quartos of Shakespeare's Plays," *The Library*, 3rd Series, iv (1913), 238. His four types of alterations appear on p. 244; G. C. D. Odell, *Shakespeare From Betterton to Irving* (New York: Scribners, 1921); A. Nicoll, *Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare* (Milford, 1921), Shakespeare Assoc. Pamphlet, No. 8, 1922; M. Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations* (Cape, 1922); A. Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama* (Cambridge University, 1923), Chap. II, section VI; A. Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth-Century Drama, 1700-1750* (Cambridge University, 1925); H. Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (Harvard, 1927); A. Nicoll, *A History of Late Eighteenth-Century Drama* (Cambridge University, 1927).

Johnson and Stevens in their fourth edition (1793) listed 70 alterations involving 31 plays from 1669 to 1786 (I, 454-462). Malone's Preface of 1790 noted 66 alterations, involving 30 plays from 1669-1777 (I, Pt. 1, pp. 236-242).

<sup>3</sup> For some interesting periodical material on this subject preceding 1766, see: *Spectator*, No. 40—on Tate's *Lear*; H. Fielding, *Historical Register* (1736)—versus Cibber; *Universal Magazine*, xvii (1755), 126—on Garrick's Song for the *W. T.*; *Critical Review*, i (1756), 144—on the "Absurdity of altering his plays"; *Monthly Review*, xiv (1756), 270—on *Catherine and Petruchio*, and Marsh's *Winter's Tale*; xx (1759), 462—

Opinion favorable to alterations of Shakespeare proceeded, with some opposition, to about 1775 and after that generally disintegrated. The chief alterer from 1750 to 1775 was Garrick,<sup>4</sup> and the chief proponent of these adaptations was F. Gentleman, who was quite agreeable to Garrick's manipulations as well as those of all others. The plays most generally changed were *Richard III*, *Timon of Athens*, *King Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Cymbeline*, and *Hamlet*. It will be best to take up the current in favor of alterations first.

The *British Magazine* in 1767 praised Cibber's adaptation of *Richard III*: "The late laureat has . . . made up a compleat tragedy of Richard the Third, which may vie with the best pieces of our great dramatic poet."<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the *Monthly Review* in 1768 approved Dance's alteration of *Timon of Athens*<sup>6</sup> and in 1771, Cumberland's.<sup>7</sup> Francis Gentleman in 1770 applauded Tate's *Lear*<sup>8</sup> (rejecting Colman's<sup>9</sup>) and offered some suggestions himself for further alteration;<sup>10</sup> he also accepted Cibber's *Richard III*<sup>11</sup> and Garrick's *Romeo and Juliet*<sup>12</sup> and *Cym-*

on W. Hawkins' *Cymbeline*; xxvi (1762), 151—on Garrick's *Florizel and Perdita*; *Critical Review*, xiii (1762), 157—on Garrick's *Florizel and Perdita*; *Theatrical Review*, March 1, 1763 (p. 107)—on Shakespeare and Garrick. See also J. Upton, *Critical Observations on Shakespeare* (London: Hawkins, 1746), pp. 14 n., 16.

<sup>4</sup> Garrick's alterations include: *Romeo and Juliet*, 1750; *MND.*, 1755, 1763 (with Colman); *The Tempest*, 1756; *King Lear*, 1756; *Catherine and Petruchio* (*T. of S.*), 1756, *Florizel and Perdita* (*W. T.*), 1756, 1758; *Antony and Cleopatra*, 1758 (with Capell); *Cymbeline*, 1761; *Hamlet*, 1771.

<sup>5</sup> viii (1767), 627.

<sup>6</sup> xxxix (1768), 81: "The play, however, in this its new form is, in some respects, better fitted for the stage, than it is in the original."

<sup>7</sup> xlv (1771), 507: "This performance hath now more regularity and decorum [Note these two neo-classic points] to recommend it to the taste of the present age, than it could boast in the wild and rough state in which it was left by its great Author."

<sup>8</sup> *Dramatic Censor* (London: Bell, 1770), i, 352, 353, 366. "We can by no means agree with the last mentioned gentleman [Colman] that the love episode of Edgar and Cordelia is superfluous or unaffecting" (p. 353).

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, i, 360-2, 365-6, 368.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, i, 359. He did the same thing in i, 178-9, for *Romeo and Juliet*.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, i, 3-4: ". . . much indebted for its variety, compactness, and spirit, to the late Colley Cibber."

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, i, 172.

*beline*.<sup>13</sup> Two years later the *Macaroni and Theatrical Magazine* approved Garrick's adaptation of *Hamlet*:

To clear this piece of these charges (which were in part not ill-founded) has been the task of the present revisor [Garrick]: how far he has succeeded, the applauses of a crowded and judicious audience have already testified.<sup>14</sup>

Bell's *Edition* of Shakespeare, 1774, followed the theatres in expunging "obscure, indelicate"<sup>15</sup> passages, and finally, Mrs. Griffith in 1775 may be cited as a feminine representative of this waning point of view: Tate's *Lear* is better because "our feelings are often a surer guide than our reason."<sup>16</sup> This date practically concludes the critics' approval of the mangling of Shakespeare in this century.

On the other side is an interesting development, from several points of view. Individual plays are rescued from alterations and restored to Shakespeare; prompter's changes are rejected; Garrick is flayed, and there is also an appeal to retain Shakespeare's original language.<sup>17</sup>

As early in this period as 1767 the *British Magazine* declared that the Duke of Buckingham[shire]<sup>18</sup> had made two plays out of *Julius Caesar* "with so little success, that his alterations were never adopted by the stage."<sup>19</sup> The same periodical in the same year attacked Otway's *Romeo and Juliet*: "... the great merit of the piece is evidently proved by Mr. Otway's vain attempt to alter it."<sup>20</sup> The next year the *Monthly Review* trampled on Tate: "The admirers of Shakespeare are obliged to Mr. Colman for having refined the excellent tragedy of *King Lear* 'from the alloy of Tate, which has so long been suffered to debase it.'"<sup>21</sup> In 1774, the same periodical called for the Fool in *Lear*: "... it is a matter of great question with us, whether the fool in King

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 76.

<sup>14</sup> Dec., 1772, p. 119.

<sup>15</sup> *Advertisement*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>16</sup> *The Morality of Shakespeare's Drama* (London: Cadell, 1775), p. 351.

<sup>17</sup> These four developments were occurring almost simultaneously.

<sup>18</sup> For this emendation I am indebted to H. Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved*, p. 375, n. 10.

<sup>19</sup> VIII (1767), 572.

<sup>20</sup> VIII (1767), 622.

<sup>21</sup> XXXVIII (1768), 245.

Lear was not a more general favorite than the old monarch himself."<sup>22</sup> Two years later the *Universal Magazine* explained, defensively and humorously, Garrick's alteration of *Hamlet*: The gravediggers complain to Garrick about being left out of the play. Garrick answers: ". . . the age does not like to be reminded of mortality: 'tis . . . very disgusting to a well-bred company"; whereupon Shakespeare is allowed to appear in spirit and in imitation of the famous "Angels and ministers of grace defend us" scene, addresses Garrick:

Freely correct my Page;  
I wrote to please a rude unpolish'd age;  
Thou, happy man, art fated to display  
Thy dazzling talents in a brighter day;  
Let me partake this night's applause with thee,  
And thou shalt share immortal fame with me.<sup>23</sup>

But the most vigorous and comprehensive objectors to alterations of Shakespeare appeared in 1784 and 1791, in Tom Davies and the *Edinburgh Bee*. Davies successively, with some disgust, rejected Cibber's *King Lear*,<sup>24</sup> Davenant's *Macbeth*,<sup>25</sup> Garrick in general and his *Macbeth* in particular,<sup>26</sup> Buckinghamshire's *Julius Caesar*,<sup>27</sup> Tate's *Lear*,<sup>28</sup> Colman's *Lear*,<sup>29</sup> and Garrick's *Hamlet*.<sup>30</sup> This wholesale overthrow of the alterers turned the tide in favor of Shakespeare, for *The Bee* in 1791 continued the devastation: "Shakespeare said just enough in one significant line [in *Measure for Measure*], which is only spun out, in the five finical modern ones";<sup>31</sup> "with what a disgraceful motely [*sic*] of nonsense and absurdity has this modern poet [Aaron Hill] confounded the beauties of Shakespeare in this play";<sup>32</sup> "Florizel and Perdita, or the Sheep-Shearing . . . Shakespeare is here mangled as usual";<sup>33</sup> and the final, slashing blow: "Benedict was . . .

<sup>22</sup> L (1774), 145. For this note I am indebted to Miss Louisa Soukup of the University of Michigan.

<sup>23</sup> LVIII (Feb., 1776), 101-2.

<sup>24</sup> *Dramatic Miscellanies* (London: Davies, 1784), I, 64.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 116-7.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 118.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 203.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 261.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 261.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 145-7.

<sup>31</sup> III (1791), 39-40.

<sup>32</sup> II (1791), 379 (*Henry V*).

<sup>33</sup> V (1791), 78.

grossly injured by Garrick's alterations . . . it is impossible both to alter and amend him [Shakespeare]." <sup>34</sup> This last sweeping statement the *Monthly Mirror* fully corroborated in 1797 by attacking Garrick again:

Shakspeare has always suffered from unskilful alterations, as is plainly proved from many vain attempts which are buried in oblivion; and I question whether *Romeo and Juliet* has gained much by the amendments of Mr. Garrick.<sup>35</sup>

Such a rejection of Garrick's adaptations as that just suggested was by no means new. Horace Walpole in 1769 remarked on Garrick's "insufferable nonsense about Shakspeare."<sup>36</sup> Johnson the same year laughed at Garrick "as a shadow" of Shakespeare, with the addendum that "Many of Shakspeare's plays are the worse for being acted, *Macbeth*, for instance."<sup>37</sup> In 1785 he attacked Garrick even more vigorously: "He has not made Shakspeare better known,"<sup>38</sup> and (to Garrick directly): "I doubt much if you ever examined one of his [Shakespeare's] plays from the first scene to the last."<sup>39</sup> Garrick himself in 1776 was rather dubious about his procedure: "I have ventured to produce *Hamlet* with alterations. It was the most impudent thing I ever did in all my life; but I had sworn I would not leave the stage till I rescued that noble play from all the rubbish of the fifth Act."<sup>40</sup> And finally his biographer, Arthur Murphy, in 1801 corroborated Garrick's doubt, for he says that Garrick, after altering *Hamlet*, "saw his error" because "he never published his alterations."<sup>41</sup>

In conclusion, it might be well to add two minor reactions in this period to the alterations of Shakespeare. Even F. Gentleman, the chief defender of Garrick, abhorred prompter's manipulations: "prompters books such miserable, mutilated objects"<sup>42</sup>—a point

<sup>34</sup> III (1791), 112.

<sup>35</sup> IV (1797), 292.

<sup>36</sup> *Correspondence* (ed. Mrs. Paget-Toynbee, 1904), VII, 325. The date of the letter was Oct. 16.

<sup>37</sup> *Boswell's Life* (ed. B. Hill), II, 92.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 244.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 244 n.

<sup>40</sup> *Correspondence* (ed. G. P. Baker, 1907), II, 126. The date of the letter was Jan. 10.

<sup>41</sup> *Life of Garrick* (Dublin, 1801), p. 308.

<sup>42</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 136.



of view which W. Kenrick in 1773 repeated: "... the greater part of the rest [of the principal parts—that is, characters—in Shakespeare's dramas] injudiciously shortened, with a view to accommodate them to the incapacities of inferior performers."<sup>43</sup> But perhaps the most interesting objection, at least from a modern editor's point of view, is Richard Warner's appeal in 1768:

And I cannot but observe, that if this method should prevail, of changing the language of the age into modern English, our venerable bard may, in time, be made to look as awkward as his cotemporary, Sir Philip Sidney now does, as trick'd out by the hands of his modern tire-woman, Mrs. Stanley.<sup>44</sup>

With this remark we may well close, for the attitude of the late eighteenth century toward stage alterations of Shakespeare thus became steadily more and more adverse.<sup>45</sup>

R. W. BABCOCK

*College of the City of Detroit*

## THE THEATRE AND THE APPRENTICES

The English drama of the eighteenth century was moralized in response to the demands of the Puritanical middle class. Although this fact may be inferred from the general drift of dramatic history, it is convenient to find a naive bit of evidence in which the London business man's opinion of the theatre is concentrated.

On November 24, 1733, *Hooker's Weekly Miscellany*<sup>1</sup> advertised *The Apprentice's Vade Mecum: or, Young Man's Pocket-Companion . . . With some occasional Remarks on Play-houses; and particularly on one lately erected*. Two weeks later, on December

<sup>43</sup> In his *Introduction to the School of Shakespeare* (London: Kenrick, 1773), p. 14.

<sup>44</sup> *A Letter to David Garrick* (London: Warner, 1768), pp. 73-4.

<sup>45</sup> For some supplementary material in periodicals on this subject of alterations, from 1766 to 1799, see: *Critical Review*, XXXII (1771), 470—on Cumberland's *T. of A.*; *Monthly Review, or Literary Journal*, III (1790), 347—on Kemble's *Tempest*; *Critical Review*, LXXI (1791), 105—on Kemble's *Tempest*; *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXI (1791), 1098—on proposal for regeneration and modernizing of Shakespeare.

<sup>1</sup> In the Burney Collection, British Museum.

8, *The Weekly Miscellany* reprinted from the *Vade Mecum* the "occasional remarks on Play-houses."<sup>2</sup> The comments of the apprentice's adviser throw considerable light on the conditions in which the moralized and sentimental middle class drama developed.

The author's criticisms of the theatre in general no doubt echo the ideas which had been current since Jeremy Collier's day, but they contain such a strong infusion of specifically commercial morality that they have a certain special interest. After insisting that "all our modern Plays are calculated for Persons in upper Life," and that the theatre causes too much loss of time and money for the person in business, the author proceeds to say in his "fourthly":

Most of our Modern Plays, and especially those written in a late licentious Reign, which are reckon'd the best, and are often acted, are so far from being so much *intended* for instruction to a Man of Business, that such Persons are generally made the Dupes and Fools of the Hero of it. To make a Cuckold of a rich Citizen, is a masterly Part of the Plot; and such Persons are always introduced under the meanest and most contemptible Characters. All manner of Cheats, and Frauds, and Villainies, committed against such, are encourag'd, and inculcated upon an Audience; the genteeler Part of which are too ready to take the Hint, as the Men of Trade throughout the kingdom every Day find to their Cost. And this in a Kingdom which owes its Support, and the Figure it makes abroad, intirely to Trade; the Followers of which are infinitely of more Consequence, and deserve more to be encourag'd, than any other Degree or Rank of People in it. Can it then be prudent, or even decent, for a Tradesman to encourage by his Presence, or support by the Effects of his Industry, Diversions so abusive of the Profession by which he lives, and by which not only these Catterpillars themselves, but the whole Nation, is Supported? Besides, even in the best Plays, the Moral lies so deep and hidden, as if the Play were not written for the Sake of it: And how few Persons are there who are capable of pursuing thro' the glittering, the dazzling Scene, the useful Application? And even this, when found, seldom falls within the Compass of the Tradesman's Sphere, as I hinted above.

Passing over some commonplace moralizing on theatre-going, we come to a frankly economic treatment of English dramatic history:

There was a Time when publick Spectacles, and Shews, Drolls and Farces (most of our present Theatrical Performances are no better) were

<sup>2</sup> I shall quote from this newspaper reprint, as I have not been able to find *The Apprentice's Vade Mecum* in the British libraries.

exhibited once a Year to very good Purpose. Every trading town or populous City had its annual Fair, which brought to it from the adjacent Villages a great Resort of People who had been labouring for Months before harder than usual, in order to save something to spend at that time, and to purchase Fairings for those they best affected. These annual Fairs were by this Means productive of Trade, and vast Quantities of all Sorts of Manufactures were disposed of at them, and still at some of 'em in the Country. It was then that *Bartholomew Fair* for the *City*, and that of *Southwark* for the *Borough*, were the only Times in which the industrious Citizens indulged, or their well-regulated Families desired to be indulged in that Sort of Diversion. But now we are grown so much more polite . . . and nothing but the Play-houses will go down. . . . Let us weigh the Usage of *these* Times against that of *those*, both with Regard to the *Trade* of the Country, and the *Morals* of the People, and it will enable us to judge whether we ought to rejoice in, or lament for, the inexpressible Difference.

At the time when *The Apprentice's Vade Mecum* was written, Lillo's *George Barnwell* was in the third year of its remarkably successful stage career. It was to be expected that the young tradesman's mentor would recommend this piece to his readers. Sir A. W. Ward says summarily that *George Barnwell* "came to be frequently acted in the Christmas and Easter holidays, being esteemed a better entertainment for the city prentices than the coarse shows with which they were at such seasons habitually regaled on the stage."<sup>3</sup> The genesis of this custom seems to be explained by the following remarks in the *Vade Mecum*:

I know but of one Instance, and that a very late one, where the Stage has condescended to make itself useful to City-Youth, by the dreadful Example of the Artifices of a lewd Woman, and the Seduction of an unwary young Man; and it would savour too much of Partiality not to mention it. I mean, the Play of *George Barnwell*, which has met with the Success I think it well deserves; and I could be content to compound with the young City Gentry, that they should go to this Play once a Year, if they would condition, not to desire to go oftener, 'till another Play of an equally good Moral and Design were acted on the Stage.

After this strikingly appreciative comment on *George Barnwell*, the author of the *Vade Mecum* proceeds to deal severely with a recently erected play-house. This theatre is obviously the second

<sup>3</sup> *The London Merchant and Fatal Curiosity*, Belles Lettres Series, Introduction, p. xiii.

*Goodman's Fields*, which had been opened in Ayliffe Street in 1731.<sup>4</sup> The apprentice's adviser resents the presence of a stage in the City district.

From what has been said in relation to this Article, I cannot forbear observing, that however the Play-houses of the gay End of the Town may be tolerated for the Amusement of Persons in upper Life, who would not perhaps, otherwise know what to do with their Time, they must be of pernicious Consequence when set up in the City, or in those Confines of it, where the People of Industry generally inhabit. The Hours of a Play-house, as above said, must undoubtedly interfere with the Hours of such Persons Business; and it is next to impossible but that the Minds of the Youth of such an End of the Town must be seduc'd and misled, must be relaxed and unbent, and set above, as they think, the Mechanick Business by which they are to support themselves, and get an honest Livelihood.

CLAUDE M. NEWLIN

*Michigan State College*

---

#### PUSHKIN AND SHENSTONE

A short play, called *The Avaricious Knight* (Скупой Рыцарь), of the great Russian poet Pushkin has always enjoyed an adventurous interest for students of English literature, owing to the fact that Pushkin represented it as a translation from "Shenstone's tragi-comedy, *The caveteous Knighth.*"<sup>1</sup> This play, in blank verse, is composed of three short scenes which detail the judgment visited upon a miserly old father who has deprived his knightly son Albert, of his rightful heritage.

Though written in 1830, the play did not appear until 1836 in a journal, *The Sovremennik* (Современникъ). In a review of the piece the great critic Belinsky was quite taken in by the poet's ascription of the play to Shenstone. He writes: "*The Avaricious Knight*, a fragment from Shenstone's tragi-comedy, is well translated, but, as a fragment, it is not necessary to pass judgment on

<sup>4</sup> Allardyce Nicoll, *The English Stage*, p. 72.

<sup>1</sup> Pushkin's spelling for Shenstone in the Russian is "Chenstone" (Ченстонъ). But there can be little doubt that he meant Shenstone. Either he mispronounced the name, or made a mistake of a kind very common in transliterating English proper names into the sounds of the Russian alphabet.

it.<sup>2</sup> A suspicion, however, that Pushkin had been deliberately mystifying his readers soon got about, for a very short time after his first statement Belinsky wrote: "His verses (Pushkin's), appearing in *Sovremennik* for 1836, were not appraised for their worth: in them lay a suggestion of the so-called decline. Thus, for example, the scenes from the *Avaricious Knight* were scarcely noticed, nevertheless if it is true that, as they say, it is an original production by Pushkin, they belong to the best of his creations."<sup>3</sup>

Shenstone, of course, never wrote "*The cavetecous Knighth*," nor is there any play in English literature, so far as I can ascertain, which might have served as an immediate source for Pushkin's supposed translation. Indeed, by observing the manuscript of *The Avaricious Knight* in conjunction with certain creative interests of the poet at the time of its composition, we can see Pushkin at work in the artist's curious business of falsifying sources. In the year 1830, Pushkin evinced a renewed interest in the drama, and he actually considered writing a book of dramatic fragments. With characteristic haste he even speculated on the title of the book that never came into existence. "Dramatic Scenes, Dramatic Sketches, Dramatic Studies, An Experiment in Dramatic Studies,"<sup>4</sup> are suggested titles which we find scribbled in one of the poet's manuscripts. And without doubt, the three short plays that he wrote in 1830, *The Avaricious Knight*, *The Stone Guest*, and *Mozart and Salieri*,<sup>5</sup> were intended as contributions towards the proposed book. Without attempting to account for Pushkin's dramatic inspiration in these plays, it is fairly certain that the form they take was influenced by several short plays printed in an English book which he knew: *The Poetical Works of Milman, Bowles, Wilson, and Barry Cornwall*, Paris, 1829.<sup>6</sup> Here we find the *Dramatic*

<sup>2</sup> Сочинения В. Бѣлинскаго, Москва 1861, II, 267.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 333.

<sup>4</sup> П. В. Анненковъ, Матеріалы къ біографіи А. С. Пушкина. СПб. 1858, I, 291.

<sup>5</sup> Скупой Рыцарь, Каменный Гость, Моцартъ и Сальери.

<sup>6</sup> This book is not to be found in Pushkin's library, but it is quite certain that he was acquainted with it at first hand. In it he undoubtedly found the originals for his translations of Wilson's *The City of the Plague* (Пиръ во время Чумы), and certain things from Barry Cornwall. For information on this point see Анненковъ I, 285, 311-12; А. О. Ишимова,

*Scenes* (pp. 1-46) of Barry Cornwall.<sup>7</sup> They are short plays of from one to three scenes, treating usually a tragi-comic subject. In form Pushkin's three plays fit this category precisely, and the fact that he should have selected "Dramatic Scenes," the very name used by Barry Cornwall, as one of the possible titles for his collection of dramas, provides some contributory evidence that Pushkin was indebted to Cornwall for the form and descriptive title of his plays.

"The Avaricious Knight," was not the title Pushkin first gave the play. Shortly after writing it he set down on the back of a manuscript the titles of dramas he had already written and intended to write.<sup>8</sup> In this list *The Avaricious Knight* appears as *The Miser* (Скупой),<sup>9</sup> an appropriate title for the play is really a psychological study of greed. Furthermore, it agrees exactly with the first title which we find in the actual manuscript of the play. Here Pushkin originally wrote the title as *The Miser*, followed by an epigram from the poet Derzhavin; and after this, in brackets, is the phrase *The cavetous Knight*, but without the name of Shenstone. Apparently not satisfied with this, he scratched out the adjective "cavetous." Nevertheless, when the play was printed in *Sovremennik* six years later (in the first number in 1836), the adjective appears again with another spelling along with the ascription to Shenstone. The full title reads: *The Avaricious Knight*. (Scenes from Chenstone's tragi-comedy, The caveteous Knighth).<sup>10</sup>

His general uncertainty concerning the spelling of "caveteous Knighth," and his final designation of Shenstone, coming as a kind of afterthought, as the author of the play from which he pretended to have adapted his own, are good indications that Pushkin was intentionally misrepresenting things. It is difficult to understand

"Драматическіе Очерки Бріана Уаллера Проктора," *Современникъ*, 1837, no. 8.

<sup>7</sup> Some time before 1830 Pushkin had come in contact with the work of Barry Cornwall. Several of his lyrics have been inspired by his reading of the English poet. Cf. Н. Яковлевъ, "Послѣдній Литературный Собесѣдникъ Пушкина," *Пушкинъ и его Современники*. 1917, VII, 28, 5.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Анненковъ I, 284-5. Here again, in these titles, Pushkin no doubt had the idea of his proposed book in mind.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Анненковъ I, 284-6.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Анненковъ I, 286. All of this title, except "The Caveteous Knighth," is written in Russian.



why he should have gone out of his way to disclaim originality for his own production, one of the fine bits of poetry in Russian. Nor, strangely enough, is it the only offense of its kind in the poet's writings. On several occasions he was guilty of positing false sources for his compositions. The best known of these is a group of unedited verses at the head of which Pushkin wrote, "From Alfred Musset," and then he substituted for this source, "From the VI Pindemonte."<sup>11</sup> Needless to say, his verses have nothing in common with anything in either of these two sources.

As for his selection of the name Shenstone, Pushkin again proves a puzzle. Many famous English authors had been translated into Russian by this time, but Shenstone is not among these. However, Pushkin might easily have become acquainted with the name at least, if not Shenstone's own works, from several books in his large library.<sup>12</sup>

E. J. SIMMONS

Harvard University

#### SCOTT AND HOFFMANN

A few days ago I reread, for the first time in years, Scott's miniature novel "The Surgeon's Daughter." I was fresh from a dip into the German romantic tales of E. T. A. Hoffmann; and in the opening chapter of "The Surgeon's Daughter" I noticed several likenesses to Hoffmann's "Das Gelübde" ("The Vow"). Turning to Lockhart's "Life,"<sup>1</sup> I found that "The Surgeon's

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Анненковъ I, 287. See also Н. В. Яковлевъ, "Къ вопросу оъ английскихъ источникахъ стихотворенія Пушкина Цыганы," П. и его Современники, 1923, IX, 36, 63.

<sup>12</sup> The following books in Pushkin's library contain some mention of Shenstone: *The Monthly Review* 1782, LXVI, 119-20 (cf. Л. Модзалевскій, "Библиотека А. С. Пушкина," Пушкинъ и его Современники, 1910, II, no. 1512); *Selections from the Edinburgh Review*, Paris 1835, I, 197, 400 (cf. Модзалевскій, 154); Johnson, *The Lives of the English Poets*, London 1826 (the volumes of this set in Pushkin's library are not cut, but it is certain that the poet was acquainted with it at first hand from other evidence, cf. Модзалевскій, item no. 1032); Bulwer-Lytton, Paris 1832. There is a signed quotation from Shenstone at the beginning of chap. III (cf. Модзалевскій, 151).

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 54 and 127 of Houghton Mifflin's 1901 ed. vol. V.

Daughter" was published near the end of 1827, and that early in that same year Scott had written for his friend Gillies a review of Hoffmann's novels. In the list of Hoffmann's books printed at the beginning of the review I found (Scott's *Miscellaneous Prose Works*, vol. 18), "Nachtstücke," 2 vols. 1816. "Das Gelübde" is one of the "Nachtstücke." Hence, although Scott does not mention the story, he had evidently read it;<sup>2</sup> and memories of it were afloat in his brain when he began his own novel. So a detailed study of likenesses becomes interesting.

In each story the scene opens in a small village before the house of a worthy citizen. In each story he is accompanied by a kind-hearted but rather shallow-headed wife. Each narrative begins on an autumn evening with the arrival of a four-horse carriage bringing two people. In each, one of the occupants is a beautiful young lady who is soon to become a mother. (In Scott her companion is her lover, in Hoffmann it is an abbess from a neighboring convent.) In each story, the young lady becomes the guest of the worthy citizen until her ordeal is over. But there is a much more peculiar and striking likeness than any of these. Both heroines, from their first appearance keep their faces covered, Scott's with a "thin silk mask, of the kind which do such uncommon service in the *Elder Comedy*"; Hoffmann's with a profusion of veils, behind which, as we learn later, there is also a mask. And both heroines keep their faces covered in this way on all occasions, even during the dangers and distress of childbirth. Both show great agitation at the mere suggestion that the coverings should be removed. Here is something rare enough, very different from forced parallelisms based on conventional situations. "Was ever honest woman brought to bed with a fause-face on?" asks one of Scott's women, and the well-read reader echoes the question.

There are other likenesses. Each worthy citizen receives a large sum of money for taking care of the mysterious guest. In each story a neighboring Catholic priest comes to have an interview with the fair stranger. This is a necessary part of Hoffmann's story, but wholly uncalled for in Scott's, whose heroine is a Jewess, and whose lover is simply turned into a Catholic in order that the priest may be summoned. In each tale the four-horse carriage

<sup>2</sup> He gives elaborate discussions of two others of the *Nachtstücke*, "Das Majorat" and "Der Sandmann."

with its other occupant does not return when expected. In each case, while the family are waiting, the worthy citizen returns home one day to find another and unwelcome visitor. In Scott this new-comer is the lady's father, in Hoffmann it is her lover. In each case the new-comer violently tears the covering from the heroine's face. Then, in both stories, he separates mother from child, Hoffmann's lover carrying the child away from its mother in wild passion, and Scott's father carrying the girl away from her infant in callous contempt. By shifting the chronology of his story, Hoffmann makes his heroine appear on the last page in her most characteristic pose: "Da trat sie, in Schleier gehüllt, an der Hand des Mönchs in das von Kerzen hell erleuchtete Zimmer." And Scott begins the last paragraph of Chapter I with this sentence: "So saying, he ascended the stair, and returned, leading down his daughter, now again masked and veiled." Subconsciously echoing Hoffmann, Scott has now, like his inspirer, supplied veils as well as mask. After the conclusion of Chapter I, Scott shows no further traces of Hoffmann.

Here is an unquestionable case of one great writer inspired by another. It is not an instance of plagiarism, for Scott's atmosphere is healthy and human where the German's is wild and nerve-racking. To realize how fully each author keeps his personality and style, we have only to compare the scenes where the face-coverings of the two heroines are torn away. Scott says:

Without minding her emotion, Monçada seized her by the arm, and with little gentleness raised her to her feet, on which she seemed to stand only because she was supported by his strong grasp. He then pulled from her face the mask which she had hitherto worn. The poor creature still endeavoured to shroud her face, by covering it with her left hand, as the manner in which she was held prevented her from using the aid of the right. With little effort her father secured that hand also, which, indeed, was of itself far too little to serve the purpose of concealment, and showed her beautiful face, burning with blushes and covered with tears.

That is a semi-realistic picture of a daughter caught in her folly. Hoffmann says:

Der Reiter—wie nun sichtlich war, ein Offizier von der französischen Jägergarde, mit vielen Orden geschmückt, hatte den Knaben aus der Wiege gerissen und in den linken, mit dem Mantel umschlungenen Arm genommen; den Rechten hatte Cölestine erfaßt, alle Kraft aufbietend, den Räuber des Kindes zurückzuhalten. Im Ringen riss der Offizier den

Schleier herab—ein todstarres marmorweisses Antlitz, von schwarzen Locken umschatte<sup>4</sup> blickte ihn an, glühende Strahlen aus den tiefen Augenhöhlen schiessend, während schneidende Jammertöne aus den halbgeöffneten unbewegten Lippen quollen. Der Alte nahm wahr, dass Cölestine eine weisse, dicht anschliessende Maske trug.

That is wild enough for Poe or Mrs. Radcliffe.

It may not be so very important to know that one chapter in a second-rate novel of Scott took hints from Hoffmann. But it is important to realize how great was the interchange of literary thought between England and Germany during the romantic generation. Since this relationship has been recently questioned, I am glad to add my bit in the much needed refutation. Scott's above mentioned review of Hoffmann's novels shows a mind full of German literature, as a few quotations will prove. "Oberon [of Wieland], in particular, has been identified with our literature by the excellent translation of Mr. Sotheby, and is nearly as well known in England as in Germany." "The 'Deutsche Sagen' of the brothers Grimm, is an admirable work of this kind." "[Fouqué's] story of 'Sintram and his Followers' is in this respect admirable; and the tale of his 'Naiad,' 'Nixie' or 'Water-Nymph' ['Undine'] is exquisitely beautiful." Likenesses between "Das Gelübde" and "The Surgeon's Daughter" are simply ripples of a great literary current, that kept flowing, Arethusa-like, under the North Sea, and bubbling up in Great Britain.

FREDERICK E. PIERCE

Yale University

#### A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S *KNIGHT'S TALE*

Professor Hulbert's article on "What was Chaucer's Aim in the *Knight's Tale*?"<sup>1</sup> over-emphasizes, it seems to me, the equality of merit between Palamon and Arcite. To quote:

The problem which Chaucer actually presents is one which we can still observe in the life about us today: which of two young men, of equal worth and with almost equal claims, shall (or should) win the lady? . . . Chaucer's conclusion that Palamon should get the lady because he had the sense to petition Venus rather than Mars for success must have seemed

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Philology*, vol. xxvi, no. 3, July, 1929, pp. 375-385.

both a satisfactory and an ingenious solution to those interested in the court of love cult.<sup>2</sup>

Certain verses in the *Knight's Tale* furnish clues that would have indicated to a mediaeval audience which of the two young men deserved to win Emelye. Shortly after they have seen her for the first time, Arcite distinguishes between the nature of his love for her and that of Palamon:

Thyn is affeccioun of holinesse,  
And myn is love, as to a creature.<sup>3</sup> (ll. 1158-1159.)

This distinction in the nature of their love for the lady is maintained throughout the tale. There is likewise a difference in degree of "loveres maladye," with which both are afflicted. In Arcite it is "lik manye / Engendered of humour malencolyk" (ll. 1374-1375), whereas Palamon suffered "martirdom" (l. 1460) for love.

The unworthiness of Arcite, by comparison with Palamon, is evidenced in his deliberate abrogation of the blood brother covenant between the two, a fact with which Palamon reproaches Arcite:

'It nere,' quod he, 'to thee no greet honour  
For to be fals, ne for to be traytour  
To me, that am thy cosin and thy brother  
Y-sworn ful depe, and ech of us til other,  
That never, for to dyen in the peyne,  
Til that the deeth departe shal us tweyne,  
Neither of us in love to hindren other, . . .  
This was thyn ooth, and myn also, certeyn.' (ll. 1129-1139)

Arcite rejects this, for love, he says, is a greater law than any oath; "positif lawe" and "swich decree" are broken everyday for love (ll. 1165-1168). This is far from the ideal conduct of the knightly class. The covenant of blood brother constituted the very highest obligation, such as is illustrated in *Amis and Amiloun* where Amis cuts the throat of his children to save his friend.

The petitions of Palamon and Arcite to Venus and Mars likewise show a difference, Arcite's petition emphasizing the physical:

Than preye I thee to rewe up-on my pyne,  
For thilke peyne, and thilke hote fyr,

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 380-381.

<sup>3</sup> The Oxford *Chaucer*, ed. W. W. Skeat.

In which thou whylom brendest for desyr,  
 Whan that thou usedest the grete beautee  
 Of fayre yonge fresshe Venus free,  
 And haddest hir in armes at thy wille. (ll. 2382-2387.)

Arcite prays Mars for victory, reiterating (ll. 2401-2405) the plea for pity of his pains of love, emphasizing his lust and desire for possession.

The appeal of Palamon the "gentil" (an epithet applied to him three times in the *Knight's Tale*) is of another sort.

He roos, to wenden on his pilgrimage  
 Un-to the blisful Citherea benigne,  
 I mene Venus, honourable and digne. (ll. 2214-2216.)

He does not pray for victory—"Ne I ne axe nat to-morwe to have victorie" (l. 2239), but to obtain Emelye, promising the Goddess to be her "trewe servant" (ll. 2234-2260). He reminds Venus, not of the passion of love, but its sorrows.

For thilke love thou haddest to Adoun,  
 Have pitee of my bittre teres smerte,  
 And tak myn humble preyer at thy herte. (ll. 2224-2226.)

Acknowledging that he knows none "So worthy to ben loved as Palamon" (l. 2794), Arcite recants as he is dying.

I have heer with my cosin Palamon  
 Had stryf and rancour, many a day a-gon,  
 For love of yow, and for my jelousye. (ll. 2783-2785.)

Professor Curry points out "that the illness of Arcite is a malady, inflicted upon him by his planetary enemy, Saturn."<sup>4</sup> It should be noticed that Saturn, intervening in a quarrel between Mars and Venus, decides in favor of Palamon,

I shal doon diligence  
 That Palamon, that is thyn owne knight,  
 Shal have his lady. . . . (ll. 2470-2472.)

In short, although Chaucer made no attempt at distinct character portrayal of the two young men, he did distinguish between their motives and attitudes towards love, making it clear that Palamon's love was the more deserving, an "affeccioun of holinesse" as contrasted with Arcite's passion and selfish desire for gratification.

*The George Washington University*

COURTLAND D. BAKER

<sup>4</sup> *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences*, chap. vi, p. 120.



### PHRASES MARKING THE TERMINATIONS OF ACTS IN THE FIRST FOLIO

Although the act- and scene-divisions of the First Folio have been studied quite intensively, no notice apparently has been taken of the fact that a word or phrase marks the endings of five acts distributed through three of the plays contained in the Comedies section of the Folio. At the close of the first act of *Two Gentlemen of Verona* appears the word, "*Finis*". The termination of Act I of *Love's Labour's Lost* is indicated by the ungrammatical phrase, "*Finis Actus Primus*." The same faulty phrase with necessary changes as to the adjective marks the ending of the second and the fourth Act of *Twelfth Night*. A comma in the phrase indicating the close of Act I of the same play, "*Finis, Actus primus*", saves it from the grammatical fault of its two fellows. This form, however, is rare. The plays contained in the Malone Society Reprints and the Tudor Facsimile texts (a total of about 240) yield but one similar example, Gascoigne, *Glass of Government* (1575), act I. The ungrammatical form which occurs thrice in the First Folio has also but one analogy in the plays of these two series, *Jack Straw* (1593-4), act III. The error indeed, was so glaring that the easy-going proof-reader of the Second Folio changed all three to the correct form, "*Finis Actus Primi* (etc.)", a phrase found in eight of the plays of the two series. The unusual form of the phrase marking the end of *Twelfth Night*, act II, also attracted the attention of the editor of the Second Folio, who altered it to *Finis, Actus primi*.

Although phrases (rarely in English, usually in Latin) mark the endings of one or more acts in eighteen plays contained in the Malone Society Reprints and the Tudor Facsimile Texts (about seven and a half per cent of the total), in no case does such a phrase alone divide one act from another—an act-heading always follows it. In *Caesar's Revenge* (1607) and *Periander in Christmas Prince* (manuscript, 1607-8), however, they serve the useful purpose of separating acts from choruses recited between them. Except for these two cases, they contribute nothing to the clarity of the divisions.

The fact that the same rare and ungrammatical phrase is employed in two plays of the First Folio, *Love's Labour's Lost*, which

was printed from a quarto, and *Twelfth Night*, which was printed from manuscript, gives us reason to believe that all five indications of the termination of acts were added by the same person. Who this person was, however, we have no means of ascertaining and the presence of these phrases in the First Folio will, we fear, throw no light on the question as to when and by whom act-divisions were introduced into Shakespeare's plays.

EDWIN E. WILLOUGHBY

*The Newberry Library, Chicago*

---

#### COLERIDGE AND SIR JOHN DAVIES AGAIN

The resemblance Dr. Frederick E. Pierce lays bare in *MLN.*, XLV (1930), 395, between Coleridge's lines about the 'great bright eye' of the ocean and stanza 49 of Davies' *Orchestra*, was first recorded, so far as I know, by Mrs. Humphry Ward. I picked up this information some 25 years ago; my manuscript note gives a reference to '*English Poets*, Vol. 1'—which at present I have no means of verifying. But there is no great need of verification. The parallel between Coleridge and Davies was rightly noted by Dykes Campbell in his edition (1893) of Coleridge's *Poetical Works*, p. 598, and by Thomas Hutchinson in his edition (1898) of *Lyrical Ballads*, p. 218. I had supposed it had long since become a commonplace of note-mongers in school-editions of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. Dr. Lowes, however, did not record it in *The Road to Xanadu*, or it cannot be found in his Index; and that may be the reason why Dr. Pierce has advertised a rediscovery. Of course I called attention to this and other reminiscences of Davies by Coleridge, and to some by Wordsworth, in my comment upon Dr. Lowes' illuminating book; see *PMLA.*, XLIII (1928), 589. But apparently no one read the comment in New England, where Davies' poem also is said to be 'little known.' Eventually, I trust, he and his *Orchestra* will here and there become better known through the work of Miss Avis L. Kidwell, if she can publish all she has discovered about Davies in the Huntington Library of Los Angeles.

LANE COOPER

*Cornell University*

## GEMATRIA

Recently Mr. Sigurd Agrell of the University of Lund published a monograph<sup>1</sup> in which he explained the names of the runes and their order in the futhark. In his investigations he encountered runic inscriptions for magical purposes, and developed the thesis that each rune had a magic number-value, and that the twenty-four runes were arranged in ascending order, beginning with the second, whose number-value is 1. The first rune in the futhark is a blind to hide the secret and really belongs at the end with the number-value 24. The sum of the values of the runes in a word or group may be of great magical significance, particularly if it is a prime number. If it can be factored the factors are examined for magic significance. Finally the sum of the values of all the words in the inscription is similarly treated. If the same factor appears in several sums the idea symbolized by that number dominates the inscription. Subsidiary factors contribute their mites as well.

Agrell finds in the cult of Mithra the numbers and their symbolical meanings which he attributes to the runes. The names of the runes were invented with an eye to the symbolical meanings of the numbers. The natural sequence of the numbers determined the order of the runes in the futhark. Men of Germanic race who served in the Roman armies during the early centuries of the present era were initiated into the Mithraic secrets and brought this mystic knowledge to the Germanic tribes.

The following list shows according to Agrell the number-value, the sound-value, the meaning of the name, and the symbolical meaning of the number and rune. I do not discuss here his reasons for ascribing number-values and symbolical meanings, though I cannot in all cases follow him.

1.	u	Bull	Help, protection.
2.	þ	Giant	Demonic number.
3.	a	God	Divine number.
4.	r	Chariot	Thor's number.
5.	k	Torch	Divinity of the dawn, also the spread five fingers which guard against the Evil Eye.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Runornas talmystik och dess antika förebild," *Skrifter utgivna av vetenskaps-societeten i Lund*. 6 (Lund, 1927).

6.	g	Gift	Njorð's number. Good crops, riches.
7.	w	Joy	Great Mithraic number.
8.	h	Hail	The sacred octade, indicating, the stone-
9.	n	Need	arched heaven of the fixed stars.
			Fate, Ananke.
10.	i	Ice	Cold and death.
11.	j	Year	Fertility.
12.	p	?	The magic powers of the earth.
13.	z	?	Ull's number.
14.	R	Alhiz	The divine twin's, the Dioscouri.
15.	s	Sun	The deified sun.
16.	t	Tiw	Tiw's number, and Mithra's.
17.	b	Birch	Frigg's number. Fertility, especially of women.
18.	e	Horse	Othin's number.
19.	m	Man	The first man. Man.
20.	l	Water	Water.
21.	ng	Ing.	Yngvi-Freyr. Fertility, wealth.
22.	o	Udal	Inherited cultivated land.
23.	d	Day	Light.
24.	f	Fee	Wealth.

This example, the famous inscription on the Golden Horn of Gallehus, which Agrell regards as a specimen of gematric virtuosity, shows how the system works:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
 e & k & h & l & e & w & a & g & a & s & t & i & R & : \\
 18 + 5 + 8 + 20 + 18 + 7 + 3 + 6 + 3 + 15 + 16 + 10 + 14 & : \\
 \hline
 & & & & & & & & & & & & & 143 \\
 \\
 h & o & l & t & i & j & a & R & : & h & o & r & n & a & : \\
 8 + 22 + 20 + 16 + 10 + 11 + 3 + 14 & : & 8 + 22 + 4 + 9 + 3 & : \\
 \hline
 & & & & & & & & & & & & & 104 & & 46 \\
 \\
 t & a & w & i & d & o & : \\
 16 + 3 + 7 + 10 + 23 + 22 & : \\
 \hline
 & & & & & & 81
 \end{array}$$

It will be noted that he counts in also the sixteen dots which separate the groups of runes. The sum of  $143 + 104 + 46 + 81 + 16$  is 390. Agrell notes that the grand total, 390, is ten times the number, 39, of the ornamental figures in the decorative belt beneath the row of runes. We now factor these sums and get the following:

$$143 = 11 \times 13$$

$$104 = 8 \times 13$$

$$46 = 2 \times 23$$

$$81 = 9 \times 9$$

$$390 = 30 \times 13$$

Ull's number, 13, dominates the inscription, and 9 and 23 are potent magic numbers. The inscription was constructed for the purpose of embodying these numbers and thus securing a powerful charm.

Similarly the rune groups on the Charnay broch represent:

$$51 = 3 \times 17$$

$$58 = 4 \times 17$$

$$64 = 8 \times 8 \text{ or } 4 \times 16$$

$$214 = 2 \times 107$$

$51 + 58 + 64 + 214 + 11$  (for the eleven dots separating the groups of runes)  $= 408 = 24 \times 17$ . Frigg's number, 17, dominates. It represents fertility and refers especially to women. But subsidiary factors of importance occur: the sacred octade is present above, and Thor's number, 4, multiplied by Tiw's or Mithra's. The antidemonic prime number, 107, multiplied by the demonic number, 2, becomes demonic. The broch was evidently to be worn by a woman, whom the charm was to protect in critical situations.

It is a simple matter to surpass in complexity the two examples above. I have gone through the numbers from 1 to 200, a range covering most of Mr. Agrell's numbers. In his system all prime numbers are magical and all doubles of prime numbers. The magic-working factors with which he operates most often are 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 18 and 24. The prime numbers, doubles of prime numbers, and the numbers containing the above highly magical factors in 1 to 200 are in all one hundred and forty-seven. The fifty-three remaining numbers are divisible by 3, the divine number; or 4, Thor's number, or 5, which guards against the Evil Eye. And Mr. Agrell does not disregard them.

How can one avoid magic numbers and combinations in such a system? They are everywhere. For example, in the unworthy name below:





## RICHARDSON'S REMOVAL TO SALISBURY COURT

The year 1724 had always been favored by the biographers of Samuel Richardson for his removal from Fleet Street to Salisbury Court, until Mr. Downs recently suggested that the change was made either in 1723 or early in the next year.<sup>1</sup> The following advertisement, which appeared in *The Weekly Journal or Saturday Post* for January 11, 1724 (and several subsequent issues), seems to prove that 1723 is the more probable date:

Any Person having a Presentation to a Living, to dispose of in Surrey, Hampshire, or in any of the Countries [sic] adjacent to London, of about 200 l. per Ann. and likely to fall in a short time; is desired to write to Samuel Richardson, a Printer, in Salisbury-Court, in Fleet-street, who will return an immediate answer.

BURNS MARTIN

Harvard University

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Dramatic Work of Samuel Foote.* By MARY M. BELDEN. Yale University Press, 1929. (Yale Studies in English, LXXX). Pp. viii + 224. \$2.50.

The incorrigible jester of the eighteenth century has at last emerged from the lurid haze of theatrical gossip as a substantial, if still very minor, author of nineteen published plays, a satirical oratorio, two critical essays, and, in part, of a five volume translation of "The Best French Comedies." To Miss Mary Megie Belden of Elmira College and to the Yale University Press we are indebted for a complete and perhaps definitive study of *The Dramatic Work of Samuel Foote*.

In bringing his literary work to the fore, Miss Belden makes no plea for its higher valuation. Indeed she comes to the inevitable conclusion, by no means new, that Foote was too much concerned with individuals and their surfaces, to portray broadly human or significant comic characters. His Major Sturgeon, *Peter Paragraph*, *Mrs. Cole*, *the Cadwalladers*, and the rest could exist as dramatic realities only in Foote's and Wilkinson's mimicry of their living originals. They must survive like waxen effigies, forever lifeless. What is more, their originals, except Whitefield, were not of sufficient consequence to make recognition interesting for the modern

<sup>1</sup> Brian W. Downs, *Richardson*, London and New York, 1928, p. 8.

reader, even with the infinite aids to identification which Miss Belden now supplies. For Foote's sake and our own, it was a pity that the great Cham frightened off the mimic with the threat of "a double quantity" of stick. Surely a Foote burlesque of Johnson, Boswell, and Goldsmith would still rank among our chief literary curiosities.

Miss Belden has added to previous data a large amount of material from contemporary journals, giving fresh color to the strife over *The Minor*, *The Orators*, and *The Trip to Calais*, with its shaft aimed at the notorious Duchess of Kingston. Of more general interest is the carefully detailed account of the scandalous Mrs. Grieve, who inspired *The Cozeners*, and of Miss Linley's affairs with Long and Sheridan, which furnished material for *The Maid of Bath* and *The Trip to Calais*. In all such matters we are now precisely informed. Students will also find helpful the accurate and thorough tracing of borrowed plots, situations, and character hints both to and from Foote's plays.

With obvious restraint Miss Belden has confined herself to the scope of her stated subject, that is, to the scholarly description and analysis of the plays in their relationships. In this respect she leaves nothing to be desired. The magic of Foote's personal fascination she has not tried definitely to revive for us, even to the extent to which it is reflected in Fitzgerald's account. Properly this is not her concern. It is only fair to Foote, however, to insist that his distinctive genius, such as it was, never could be transferred to the printed page. It was sufficient to force Johnson to admit against his will: "I was obliged to lay down my knife and fork, throw myself back upon my chair, and fairly laugh it out." This same fascination caused Garrick, in spite of much ridicule and abuse on Foote's part, to come repeatedly to his assistance and finally to defend him as he faced a charge that might have frightened off more intimate friends. "Within five minutes," said Murphy, when Foote had failed him in a business agreement, "he would have laughed me into good humour." As the last curtain was descending on the ill-starred mime, Johnson could write: "The world is really impoverished by his sinking glories. Murphy ought to write his life—at least, give to the world a Footeana."

The "Footeana" can never be. One might wish, however, that among her profuse citations, Miss Belden had included more to illustrate the values she justly praises in Foote's written dialogue as "individualized and natural and sparkling with irony." "As burlesque," she writes, "surely nothing could be more chaste in a literary sense than Mother Cole's Methodist jargon," set forth, she adds, "in its pristine quality without exaggeration."

This last statement seems hardly consistent with her later assertion that Foote "did not turn his satire upon those phases of

Methodism that were really open to just criticism." Like Fitzgerald she blames Foote for a failure to appreciate in Whitefield's teaching the genuine spirituality of which now the world has little doubt, and at the same time for departing from his professed principles of satire in burlesquing Whitefield's personal mannerisms and defects. We must agree that Foote had no flair for the spiritual and that he was exasperatingly inconsistent in applying theory to practice. At all times he was ready to risk his reputation freely for a cheap laugh or for malicious revenge. We cannot, however, deny him a modicum of sincerity and even consistency in his satire. In two purposes he was at least persistent and there was in his wording the ring of sincerity. In his early *Treatise on the Passions* he exclaimed, regarding his fellow actors:

Oh! Curse on those unmannerly bellowing Blusterers. Go, go, ye Herods, go and learn that Sentiments, nay, Passions, can have Energy and Force without Noise and Vociferation. Reform, ye Ranters! or by Thalia, Clio, and all the Nine whose Inspirations you have villainously abused, I'll attack you in the Face of the Audience, and with the Pipe of Gracchus, force you to Moderation, ye Termagants.

Although we have only fragments of his *Diversions*, in which he applied his lash to Quin, Macklin, Barry, and others, we may safely believe that he exerted by his mimicry and writing an influence secondary to none, except, perhaps, Garrick's, in forcing the actors and their public to distinguish between the true and the false in the methods of dramatic expression.

More persistent, perhaps, was his lashing of the charlatan. In *The Minor* as in *The Orators*, the quackery of eloquence was his mark. This fact we should keep in mind when we judge his attitude towards Whitefield. Granting his own charlatanism, his unfairness and misrepresentation, even his meanness and spiritual blindness, we ought in fairness to recognize that to him Whitefield's pulpit behavior and his evangelical methods were detestable, as they were also to many better churchmen of the time. As he bluntly put it, Whitefield was

one of those itinerant field orators, who, tho' at declared enmity with common sense, have the address to poison the principles, and at the same time pick the pockets of half our industrious fellow subjects . . . I consider these gentlemen in the light of public performers, like myself . . . our purpose is the same and the place immaterial.

Miss Belden gives Foote full credit, at least, for preferring the real and satirical in comedy to the exaggerated and sentimental. His popularity made this, his most commendable zest, one of the great theatrical and literary influences of the age. He clearly prepared the way for Goldsmith and Sheridan and even supplied them with plot material and character suggestions. More of his invention went into the making of Goldsmith's farces, perhaps, than Miss Belden notes.

The surprise is, after all, that as a mimic he accomplished so much of lasting value. He was a dramatic cartoonist and was so recognized and tolerated by the wisest of his age. It is our misfortune not to know, nor care enough about, any of his victims to see them clearly as we read. Rarely can he make us lay down our knives and forks and laugh it out as he did the great company at the Bedford or delight us as he did his audiences at the Haymarket, Smock Alley, and Drury Lane. Miss Belden has done more than any one to assist us to such an enjoyment, and, at the same time, to give our entertainer, if not a higher place, at least a more definite one in the annals of the stage.

E. BRADLEE WATSON

Dartmouth College

---

*The Dunciad Variorum. With the Prolegomena of Scriblerus* By Alexander Pope. Reproduced in Facsimile from the first Issue of the original Edition of 1729. With an Introductory Essay by ROBERT KILBURN ROOT. Princeton University Press, 1929. 42 + 18 + 32 + 124 pp. \$4.50.

This volume is not merely a pleasant reminder of a two-hundredth anniversary. Professor Root is quite right in thinking that the *Dunciad* is best read in its 1729 form, and this facsimile will enable students to have that pleasure without being restricted to the relatively rare original editions. In his compact Introduction Professor Root gives an excellent evaluation of the literary qualities of the poem, discusses incisively its peculiarity as a mock-heroic, and comments admirably on its seriousness of purpose and on the validity and brilliance of its satire.

The history of the composition and publication of the poem is inevitably less satisfactory; for that is a very complex subject impossible of full treatment in the relatively brief limits of an Introduction. Root is certainly on safer grounds than many of his predecessors when he explains Pope's manoeuvres as sportive rather than malign. The key to understanding these manoeuvres lies, I suspect (but do not surely know), in the matter of copyright as well as in dangers of libel suits. Some of the tricks, far from being mysterious, were simply devices that Grub-street practised daily. Such were the common appearances of "A. Dod" in their imprints. "Dublin Printed, London Reprinted" is another common dodge for political pamphleteers—whose tactics Pope was borrowing against themselves. This last device, however, carried difficulties. In Pope's day anything printed in Dublin could be pirated with impunity in London from a *Dublin* edition. (That fact explains, incidentally, why Pope tried so hard to get his letters

to Swift back from Dublin unprinted.) Documents in the Public Records Office and the British Museum will, I believe, someday show that when the time came to publish the second edition of the 1729 *Dunciad*, Gilliver, the publisher, refused to proceed until he could have copyright protection against piracy. Pope loved his joke of anonymity, as did the Grub-street journalists theirs, and so he assigned his rights to three distinguished ornaments of the peerage, who in turn sold them to Gilliver for £100 without using Pope's name in the transaction. The peers kept the poem still technically anonymous; they gave Gilliver rights in the poem (which anonymity made difficult in view of the existence of Dublin editions); and through the special privileges of their rank they helped terrify piratical printers. Pope did not recover sure rights in the poem until the spring or summer of 1743—a fact that delayed for months the publication of the fully revised *Dunciad* in four books. But that story can be authoritatively told only when some one has mastered the intricacies of the copyright cases of Pope's day; and, so far as is known, no one has yet done that.

In a work of this sort the text of the facsimile is of course the important matter. A few remarks concerning the limitations inherent in facsimiles may consequently be in point.<sup>1</sup> This is a good facsimile; but it is hardly exaggerating to say that no such thing as a perfect facsimile exists. In any known process of facsimile reproduction exaggerations or diminutions of spots or of light inking are bound to occur. If the original page contains a small brown spot, the spot in facsimile may come out black and may look like punctuation. If the inking is light in parts of the original, symbols perfectly visible there simply will not reproduce in facsimile without interminable effort on the part of the photographer and the plate-maker. Flaws in photographic plates account for strange happenings in the process. If you own an original 1729 quarto of the *Dunciad*, it will probably differ from Root's facsimile in at least the following minute points: (of course I have not examined the copy from which the facsimile was made, but I have examined pages in the two Hoe copies now in the Huntington Library) In the "Letter to the Publisher," p. 5, there is no mark of punctuation in the original after *care* (last line of the page), nor after *could*, p. 6, third line from the bottom of the page, nor anything but a parenthesis between *papers* and *for* on p. 8, fourth line from the top. (This parenthesis has been poorly restored by hand apparently: in the original it is a true type.) Frequent examples of what seem to be broken type are simply added eccentricities in the process of reproduction. In facsimile dots disappear that in the original are distinct over *i*'s

<sup>1</sup> Similar remarks may be noted in the review by W. W. Gregg of Dr. Tannenbaum's "Shakspeare Forgeries," *Rev. of Eng. Stud.*, v (1929), 344-58.



(See pp. 6 and 11 of the "Letter to the Publisher"). In general the appearance of broken type in facsimile is no sure evidence that the type may not appear perfect in the original. Page 11 of the "Letter to the Publisher" prints *wherein* with an undotted *i* (line 7); prints *in* (line 19) with an apparently broken *n*, and prints *Admiration* (line 25) with an apparently broken *m* and with a spot under the *n*. In the note to Bk. I, l. 104, at least two letters quite visible in the Hoe copies are invisible in the facsimile. Of course the Princeton copy of the *Dunciad* may have these flaws, but it is a safe guess that these are simply typical examples of what is bound to happen in making reproductions of this sort. The large font used in the text of the poem reproduces very well; the footnotes in smaller type have more than once blurred.

I point out these defects, not in criticism but rather in explanation of the limitations inherent in facsimiles. I suggest that editors should always (1) identify the copy of the book used in reproduction; (2) specify clearly the particular method of reproduction used (this gives a clue as to the sort of eccentricity to be expected); (3) indicate the fact (if it is a fact) that imperfections inevitable in the process of reproduction have been removed by "retouching" or "mending" the plates; and, most important of all, (4) give a list of corrigenda for spots where the exaggerations or diminutions unavoidable in reproduction are such as to give a possibly false impression of the original. The avoidance of such impressions by the means indicated as (3) is usual, but it of course tends to subvert the authority of facsimile texts. Root's methods are to be commended in general; he might have helped by giving such a list as suggested in (4). Proof-reading for facsimiles is terrifically difficult. If the Facsimile Text Society does not recognize this fact at the start, the Society will be short-lived. The present popularity of facsimiles seems to warrant this caution against implicit trust of them on minute points.

GEORGE SHERBURN

University of Chicago

---

*Diaries of William Johnston Temple, 1780-1796.* Edited with a Memoir, by LEWIS BETTANY. New York, Oxford University Press, 1929. \$7.00.

Like Boswell, Boswell's most intimate friend kept a diary, though not with such assiduity or fulness. These six thin journals, now in the possession of Temple's great-granddaughter, are here printed for the first time by Mr. Bettany, author of *Edward Jerningham and his Friends*, who has now had access to practi-



cally all the Temple MSS. extant. He makes no claim for them as literature, addressing his book "chiefly to Boswellian scholars and amateurs." But I have found, after reading the journals through for the second time, that, though forbidding in appearance because of the large number of entries which are nothing more than lists of books read and letters written, they do have in a remarkable degree the power of making real to the reader the nervous, frustrated, self-torturing nature of their author.

Temple was not a great man. With an ambition almost as boundless as Boswell's, he had just will-power enough to organize his days into a comfortable routine which kept him always preparing for a great historical work that seems never to have got beyond the stage of notes. A month before his death he wrote in his diary, "Alas! though my Life has been blameless, yet I fear it has not been useful; for what have I produced or done?", and in the fourth entry from the end he laments, "No progress in my Papers. 8-9 + 10-1 + 6-10 but 8"—which probably means, "If I study and write from 8 to 9 and from 10 to 1 and from 6 to 10, it makes only eight hours a day."

Mr. Bettany has printed the journals *verbatim* and *literatim*, with very few textual notes, confining himself almost entirely to biographical notices of the persons mentioned. These he collects before each journal, an excellent arrangement for a reader who is going straight through the book, but very inconvenient for the student who consults it as a work of reference. The "Boswellian specialist and amateur" to whom the book is chiefly addressed would find his ends better served by a full index (there is no index at all) and the more orthodox arrangement of footnotes. I should also have been grateful for a good deal more of the kind of special annotation which Mr. Bettany alone is in a position to provide.

Mr. Bettany's memoir of Temple is spirited and judicious. As no other biography of Boswell's most intimate friend is likely ever to be written, I feel that I can make this review of most value by adding here some notes based principally upon the MS. material in the Isham Collection.

P. xx. A letter from Boswell to Margaret Montgomerie shows that Boswell's first visit to Mamhead covered 3 to 5 November 1769. In April 1775 he was "accompanied by the Corsican patriot, General Paoli," only as far as Wilton.

P. xlix. Boswell says that Nancy Temple suffered from "a defect in one of her legs and feet which made her walk lame" (Journal, May 14, 1790). One gets no hint of this from her father's diary.

P. lxxvii. Four of Temple's letters to Boswell survive in the Isham Collection, and seem to be excellent specimens of the entire correspondence. Two (*Boswell Papers*, VIII. 175-178, 195-201) give Boswell advice on his marriage, and one was written on the occasion of Mrs. Boswell's death.

P. lxxi. Boswell's letter to his brother on 13 October 1794 instructing him to deposit five pounds "to the account of the Rev. Mr. Baron at

Lostwithiel, Cornwall," who "took charge of paying the gratuity to Mary Broad," does, on the face of it, "look extremely odd and unaccountable," but the affair turns out to be much to Boswell's credit, and proves Mr. Bettany's suspicions of "irons in the fire, of course" to be unwarranted. Mary Broad was an unfortunate young woman, a native of Fowey, sent to Botany Bay, I suppose for felony. She escaped and returned to London, where she was befriended by Boswell, who furnished her with money, and helped her to rejoin her family. (He probably also defended her in court and secured her pardon, but the diary for the necessary date is missing.) She sailed for Fowey on 13 October 1793 on the *Ann and Elizabeth*. Boswell saw her the day before she sailed "and wrote two sheets of paper of her curious account of the escape from Botany bay." These, alas! are lost. He also "assured her of ten pounds yearly as long as she behaved well; being resolved to make it up to her himself in so far as subscriptions should fail." It was settled that the days of payment should be 1 November and 1 May. This letter of 13 October 1794 refers to one of these semi-annual payments, and indicates that Mary Broad was still in Cornwall.

P. lxxi. Temple's "unknown" Johnsonian publication was *The Character of Doctor Johnson. With Illustrations from Mrs. Piozzi, Sir John Hawkins, and Mr. Boswell*. London, Dilly, 1792. See *TLS.*, 22 May 1930.

P. 97. The loss of Temple's diary for 1792 covering the visit of Boswell and his daughters is to be regretted, but is of less importance since Boswell's full Journal of the trip has survived.

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

Yale University

*Elizabeth Gaskell*. By GERALD DEWITT SANDERS. With a bibliography by CLARK S. NORTHUP (Cornell Studies in English, XIV), New Haven, Yale University Press, 1929. Pp. xvii + 267.

Professor Sanders has set himself very definite limits in this book on Elizabeth Gaskell. He no doubt would have liked to write the needed Gaskell biography, but since important letters and much original material is still withheld by the Gaskell executors, has thought best to give it up. The book then is to be simply a study of Mrs. Gaskell's works, with the addition of a chronological outline of her life and activities, with no attempt "to build up a supposititious biography out of material culled from her creative writings." Perhaps this resolution has something to do with the comparative shortness of the book, which has only 155 pages of text. But the facts admitted to these pages have been weighed with discrimination. There are no statements of the kind that caused Mrs. Gaskell so much trouble in her *Life of Charlotte Brontë* and that are decidedly disapproved of here. "Mrs. Gaskell's most ardent admirers can offer no apology for the manner in which she worked all these things into the *Life*. It threw no light upon Charlotte Brontë's character to picture her father cut-

ting up his wife's gigot sleeves, and to have repeated this from a servant's gossip was unpardonable . . . Branwell's love affairs, even had the report of them been absolutely truthful and substantiated with incontrovertible facts, were outside the sphere of the biography and should have been omitted." No backdoor gossip here, and if there are sins let them be sins of omission! The decision not to rework the ground covered by Louis Cazamian's *Le Roman Social en Angleterre* entails a further limitation, and permits a very rapid sketch of economical and political background to pass muster, leaving the foreground to the description of Mrs. Gaskell's life in relation to her career as a novelist, conditions of writing and publication, and to criticism.

Mrs. Gaskell's social doctrine is described as a steadfast confidence in the power of Christian love and mutual understanding, working through individual rather than legislative channels, to better conditions. How this differs from Dickens' Christmas Spirit we are not told, although this seems an obvious and natural comparison, especially since Mrs. Gaskell's connection with Dickens was an important one. One might also expect a comparison with the ideas of Disraeli as expressed in his trilogy which came out in the years immediately preceding the publication of *Mary Barton*. We are told very little about Mrs. Gaskell's reading, or her relation to other writers, except for her friendship with Charlotte Brontë; even here there is no comparison of the two authors as personalities, although some letters from their correspondence are printed. Professor Sanders does point out some probable debts to Crabbe, but there were others. One has only to dip into her *Cranford* to see how well she knew the eighteenth century.

The author relies solely on his subject's life, her novels, and his comments upon them to tell us all he cares to have told about her. There is no especial interpretation of her life, no psychological analysis of her personality. Yet in spite of what seems to me an unnecessary rigid attitude, this is a welcome book. It is authentic and dependable and will be a great help to the future biographer. Professor Northup's bibliography is rich and up-to-date, and is indexed, like the book itself.

JAMES R. FOSTER

*Syracuse University*

---

*Richard Hakluyt and The English Voyages.* By GEORGE BRUNER PARKS. New York, American Geographical Society, 1928. Pp. xvii + 289. \$5.00.

This, the first real biography of Hakluyt, is a study of considerable magnitude. It is carefully edited and well printed; it has

interesting and valuable illustrations and an important introduction by Dr. James A. Williamson. Professor Parks greatly expands our knowledge of Hakluyt, of the history of his name, of the time and place of his birth, and of his ancestry. He correlates the work of Richard Hakluyt, preacher, and that of his older cousin, Richard Hakluyt, lawyer of the Middle Temple, who is not even mentioned in the biographical sketch in the *DNB*.

But the external facts of Hakluyt's life are secondary in Professor Parks's study, and are treated chiefly in the appendices. The main theme is the growth of geographical knowledge and the development of navigation which changed England from her mediæval isolation, when foreign ships carried even the fish which she consumed, to maritime supremacy with colonies in America and an empire in Asia.

The political and commercial organizing which led to the founding of the British Empire is well known; but the equally important organizing of geographical knowledge Professor Parks is the first to record adequately. In an age in which written geography necessarily lagged far behind the rapidly advancing knowledge of voyagers, the two Hakluyts (and especially the younger one) were middlemen between the traveller, whose experience made him an authority upon routes and markets, and the merchant and the colonizer. They were geographical brokers, assimilating the new information as fast as it could be gathered and making it available. The patriotic motive is first and the scientific second. The late Sir Walter Raleigh depicted Hakluyt as a scholarly recluse accepting what travellers brought to him; but Professor Parks shows him to have been a tireless searcher who took the initiative in the quest for information. At the close of the book it is Hakluyt the scientist—the student of geography, the editor of accounts of travel, and the adviser of merchants and planters—who stands forth clearly; Hakluyt the man—the husband, the father, and the preacher—is a shadowy figure of whose character there is little record.

In the great mass of details Professor Parks does not lose his way. The life of Hakluyt is a point from which one can resurvey the English renaissance and view Elizabethan ideas and ideals in a new perspective. Professor Parks emphasizes the fact that (in the words of Dr. Williamson) the "Elizabethan age was not spacious, as we are sometimes told, but narrow and needy." Its "adventures were not undertaken from swashbuckling zest but because good men found their country in a tight place and staked their lives and fortunes to redeem it." Drake, whose brilliant exploits have been seized upon by romantic historians, is an extremely fortunate exception; more typical, remarks Dr. Williamson, are Gilbert, Walsingham, and Michael Lok—men who toiled hard, risked much, and gained nothing for themselves by it.

University of Illinois

A. W. SECORD

*Daniel Defoe. Essay on Projects (1697). Eine Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichtliche Studie.* Von ERNST GERHARD JACOB. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1929. 142 pp.

*Realism in Daniel De Foe's Narratives of Adventure.* [By] GERRIDINA ROORDA. Wageningen, H. Veenman & Zonen, 1929. 142 pp.

Dr. Jacob's thesis (Leipzig) appears in the series known as *Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten*, edited by Professor Herbert Schöffler. Like other German scholars who have investigated the beliefs and practices of Protestants, Dr. Jacob is interested in the economic and social aspects of his subject. In particular he attempts to place Defoe's "Essay" in its historical setting between the revolution of 1688 and the War of the Spanish Succession. Dr. Jacob does not trace Defoe's numerous ideas to their origin; but he prepares the way for that undertaking by pointing out the conditions of the times which called forth the essay. He discusses the new spirit fostered by interest in experimental science; the projector abroad; the need of adequate credit and banking systems for commerce; and the necessity of financing the war with France.

The most original and important part is chapter VI in which Dr. Jacob considers the originality of Defoe's ideas. He takes them up one by one, first pointing out the evil which the project was to correct and then studying the remedy—its origin, its fitness, and its subsequent history. He concludes that Defoe was not the brilliant originator of his ideas, but the practical man, shrewd enough to see what was useful in the welter of suggestions then in the air, in France and Holland as well as in England.

If I have a complaint, it is not that Dr. Jacob narrows his field too much, but rather that he does not plow very deep. A glance at his classified bibliography reveals few *zeitgenössische Werke* in proportion to the secondary works; there are, in fact, but eight entries, including the writings of Fénelon and two modern books of selections. It is only fair to add that this section of the bibliography does not include all the works consulted. Among the biographies there is no mention of a brief but important sketch of Defoe's life by Aitken (Introduction to *Romances and Narratives of Daniel Defoe*, 1895), of Trent's "Defoe How to Know Him" (1916), or of Dottin's "La vie et les aventures de Daniel De Foe," 1924. I mention this because Dr. Jacob calls Thomas Wright Defoe's latest biographer and because the sketch of Defoe's life is somewhat out of date. For example, he gives the year of Defoe's birth as 1661. Long ago Aitken proved 1661 to be too late and suggested 1659 or 1660; and now Dottin has



narrowed the time to the latter half of 1660, since a sister had been born on June 19, 1659.

If Dr. Jacob leans too heavily upon the older biographies, the same cannot be said of Dr. Roorda whose thesis (University of Amsterdam) shows familiarity with recent studies of Defoe. Even though she does not make full use of them, she reads them critically and occasionally points out errors in them. After briefly sketching the religious, political, philosophical, and literary currents which influenced Defoe, Dr. Roorda analyzes "Robinson Crusoe" (I and II), "Captain Singleton," and the "New Voyage". Defining realism as "close resemblance to what is real" and "fidelity of representation," she is interested not in whether Defoe's narratives are true, but in whether they impress the reader as true. Defoe's sources and raw materials she hardly considers at all. Nor does she contribute any considerable body of new facts. But though she repeats much that has already been said of Defoe's methods, she is alert in detecting what is actually realistic and what fails of being so in the novels studied.

A. W. SECORD

*University of Illinois*

---

*The Pepys Ballads.* Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Harvard University Press, vols. I, II, III, 1929-1930. Each \$3.50.

In these three attractive volumes Professor H. E. Rollins continues his scholarly reprints of seventeenth-century popular lyrics. They are the first of a projected series of six, the purpose of which is to make available the hitherto unprinted pieces in the ballad collection of the noted diarist Samuel Pepys. A complete reprint of the Pepys collection is not planned by Professor Rollins. He includes in his first and second volumes texts earlier in date than 1640 that do not appear in the Ballad Society's *Roxburghe Ballads*, 1871-1880, and the *Bagford Ballads*, 1878, or in the *Pepysian Garland* edited by him in 1922. The third volume reprints many ballads from the years 1666-1688.

Professor Rollins executes his editorial responsibilities with his usual care, discrimination, and thoroughness. Ample headnotes are provided for the individual texts, literary and historical allusions are followed out, and significant features are brought into relief. Comparatively few of the songs are assigned to their authors. In subject-matter and lyrical patterns they are of the types staple for their period. There are many songs of trades and professions, historical and pseudo-historical songs, songs with literary associations, country ditties, songs of marriage, romances, love ballads, and



many sermons and moralizing pieces. In the third volume are reprinted songs dealing with political events and picturesque happenings having news value, and songs of murders and prodigies—familiar topics of broadsides—appear in abundance. The assortment of material is miscellaneous enough for all tastes. A twentieth-century reader of the Pepysian ballads is struck, I think, by their unmistakable superiority in taste, expression, and lyrical gift to the mass of popular song of the same status today.

The value of such a reprint of broadsides lies in the picture of the times that they record for the historian and in the display of types and topics of popular song that they present for the student of literature. "More solid Things do not show the Complexion of the times so well as Ballads and Libels" is the appropriate quotation prefixed by the editor to his third volume. The completed series of *The Pepys Ballads* will be noticed at greater length in the columns of *Modern Language Notes*.

LOUISE POUND

University of Nebraska

---

*Sachwörterbuch der Deutschkunde. Unter Förderung durch die Deutsche Akademie herausgegeben von Dr. WALTHER HOFSTAETTER und Prof. Dr. ULRICH PETERS. Bd. I: A-J. Leipzig und Berlin: G. B. Teubner. VIII u. 604 pp. R. M. 31.*

Dies Wörterbuch ist bereits vor dem Kriege erwogen und geplant und in den ersten Jahren nach dem Kriege von neuem in Angriff genommen worden. Die jetzigen Herausgeber haben dann 1926, zwar auf die Grundlagen ihrer Vorarbeiter gestützt, gemäß der Neueinstellung der Literaturforschung und der Pädagogik einerseits, der Gebietserweiterung des Begriffes Deutschkunde andererseits das Werk neu umgrenzen und seinen Inhalt neu aufteilen müssen. "Es sollte nunmehr als Grundlage deutscher Bildung eine Gesamtdarstellung deutscher Kultur unter steter Berücksichtigung ihrer Verbindung mit fremdvölkischen Kulturen im Nehmen und Geben bringen."

Das ist, soweit man nach dem ersten Bande urteilen kann, glänzend gelungen. Es ist überraschend, wie verhältnismäßig einheitlich bei 25 Fachberatern und 146 Mitarbeitern die einzelnen Artikel ausgefallen sind und wie durchgreifend sie den Zielpunkt, der im obigen Zitat angegeben ist, im Auge haben. Man vergleiche z. B. die Artikel *Antike* (I. Die Antike und die deutsche Geschichte, mit sechs zeitlichen Unterabteilungen; II. Antike Kulturleistungen mit neun Unterabteilungen in Wirkungsfeldern), *Arbeit*, *Aufklärung*, *Baukunst*, *Drama*, und man wird von der

Reichhaltigkeit und Gedrängtheit der Information erstaunt sein. Der Artikel *Baukunst* mit seinen klaren Grundrissen und seinen ca. 20,000 Worten auf 25 Seiten ist allein ein kleines Buch. Aber auch die kürzeren Artikel werden dem Lehrer und Germanisten zu schneller Orientierung willkommen sein. Ich denke z. B. an den Überblick über die *Anredeformen*, der in einer Seitenspalte alles Notwendige klar zusammenfaßt, oder an die knappen Dichterbiographien, die jedesmal auch die wichtigsten Ausgaben und Monographien verzeichnen. Bei fremdsprachlichen Dichtern steht dem Plane gemäß die deutsche Beziehung im Blickpunkte, so bei Byron (S. 204) Goethe, Heine und Chamisso. Ein Thema wie Don Juan oder Herakles erweitert sich zu einer kleinen Sachgeschichte.

Das Auslandsdeutschtum ist leider verhältnismäßig kärglich bedacht worden. Ich habe in dem einschlägigen Artikel nichts über deutsche Auslandsschulen gefunden, auch vergeblich nach Auskunft über Deutschunterricht in den Vereinigten Staaten gesucht in dem umfassenden und gutorganisierten Aufsatz *Amerika* von Friedrich Schöнемann. Deutsch-englische Literaturbeziehungen stehen andererseits durchweg hinter der Behandlung der deutsch-französischen zurück, was umso erstaunlicher ist, als auf dem ersteren Gebiete unsere Kenntnisse durch Gesamtarbeiten viel weiter gefördert sind. In der Literaturangabe des Artikels *England* vermisste ich L. M. Price *English-German Literary Influences* und B. Q. Morgans unentbehrliche Bibliographie der Übersetzungen ins Englische (an derselben Stelle, S. 289, ist übrigens auch das Wort *Book* im Titel *The Oxford Book of Engl. Verse* versehentlich ausgefallen).

Aber das sind Einzelheiten, welche unser Gesamturteil nicht wesentlich beeinträchtigen können. Deutschlehrer hierzulande werden das Buch besitzen müssen, ja werden mit Genuß und Vergnügen darin lesen. Est ist erstaunlich, daß deutsche Wissenschaft und zwar auf allen Gebieten nicht nur neuorientierend tätig ist, sondern auch zu dieser Sammelarbeit Mut und Muße hat, wie sie neben einem solchen Sachwörterbuch auf unserm Felde in dem großangelegten *Handbuch der Literatur* und der neuen, jetzt Reclamschen Anthologie *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen* sich betätigt.

ERNST FEISE.

*Das Bild in der Dichtung.* VON HERMANN PONGS (I. Band: Versuch einer Morphologie der metaphorischen Formen). Marburg, N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927. Pp. xx + 513.

Es ist unmöglich im Rahmen einer kurzen Besprechung diesem außerordentlich umfangreichen, umfassenden und schwerflüssigen

Werke gerecht zu werden. Im Bestreben, seine Darstellung bildlicher Denkformen allseitig zu verankern, greift der Verfasser auf sämtliche Randgebiete über, Philosophie, Psychologie, Anthropologie, Philologie u. s. w, sodaß eine Art Kompendium der modernen Forschung entsteht, von Max Weber bis zu Lévy-Bruhl und Rudolf Otto. Dann aber fügt er zu dieser vielseitigen Belesenheit und Kenntnis seine eigene schwierige und abstrakte Terminologie. Wenn das Buch auf diese Weise den Fehler aller Erstlingswerke einer suchenden Zeit deutlich zur Schau trägt, so gelingt es ihm andererseits auf einem Gebiete, in dem mit leerem und oberflächlichem Klassifizieren und ödem Formelkram viel und lange gesündigt worden ist, Schäfte und Stollen in die Tiefe zu treiben.

Die Haupterkenntnis, die Pongs zutage fördert, ist die erstaunliche Ergiebigkeit der Bild-erforschung in ihrer Beziehung zur Lebensphilosophie der Dichter. Die Metapher findet damit ihren wichtigen Platz in der Reihe von Handschrift über Rhythmus, Melodie, Syntax und alle andern Eigentümlichkeiten bis hinauf zur Weltanschauung als Mittel zur Charakterisierung dichterischer Wesensart. Im Einzelnen wird dann eine Staffellung der Gleichnisformen der Intensität nach geboten, über deren Tragweite ich vorläufig nicht zu urteilen vermag. Ich habe mich mit dem Werke ein paar Monate (mit Unterbrechungen) herumgeschlagen und kann noch nicht behaupten, einen klaren Überblick gewonnen zu haben. Aber ich bereue die Zeit nicht, die ich darauf verwendet habe und bin mir durchaus bewußt, daß kein Literaturhistoriker an dieser Arbeit vorübergehen kann. Übrigens entschädigen schon die immer wieder erfreuenden Erkenntnisse in Analysen zitierter Dichtwerke von Beowulf bis Becher und von Dante bis Döblin. Der Verfasser ist kein Pedant.

ERNST FEISE

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*Tales of the North American Indians* selected and annotated by  
STITH THOMPSON. Harvard University Press, 1929. Pp.  
xxiii + 386.

Looking through European bibliographies of fairytales one is often struck by the relative paucity of references to North American Indian tradition. One reason is, of course, that the tales of the New World are so far removed from the European ones that the points of contact are limited in number, but in many cases the chief cause is that this vast store of tradition is not easily accessible to European folklorists. This book of Professor Thompson's will be welcomed the more eagerly as it offers an excellent introduction to what Professor Boas calls "the most extensive and accurate record of myth tale and legends possessed by a primitive

people." It may indeed be said that the volume is as indispensable guide to the tales of the Indians as are the famous Bolte-Polivka *Anmerkungen* to European tradition, and any one acquainted with the study of fairytales will feel the weight of such a compliment.

The main interest of international study will perhaps centre upon the question of connexions with European tradition. The problem differs with different classes of stories. There are the tales imported from Europe in later days, and in a previous study the author traced the fortunes of 30 European stories in North America. The unique value of such cases is apparent. There is a transmission to an entirely new world of ideas, and the different stages of the process are visible. These are: the European versions, the story as told by immigrants in America, and as told by the Indians. Since all attempts of explaining the ubiquity of folktales have to reckon with borrowing and transmission, such instances are of the greatest importance; in most cases one has to assume long periods of time between present versions and their arrival in a country. Bible stories fall into line with other tales, and it is strange to see how, for instance, a story like that of Adam and Eve, which in itself has a strong "aitiological" twist, lends itself to further development in the same direction.

Far more difficult is the problem of earlier connexions where the similiarity between tales is the only proof of a transmission. Thus one particular case raises difficult problems, and a passage from America to Europe seems the only explanation. It is the tale-cycle, containing "the bungling host," the fishing, and "the animal marriage." There are many Indian versions, and a corresponding number from the Eskimos, but the strange thing is that the story is rather well known in Norway. The fishing episode is common to all Norse versions, but the assumption that the Eskimos got the story from the ancient Norse settlers, seems untenable in face of the fact that the tale was known "through the whole west-easterly Canadian belt." The tale did hardly reach Norway from the east, it is known in the other Scandinavian countries, and the nearest trace of it to the east is a corrupt version from the Kola peninsula.

Or, to mention instances of wider import, there is the "Smith-sound Swan-maiden story." The motif is a commonplace in traditional stories from Greenland to Melanesia, and while all may agree that the idea of a human being marrying an animal may have arisen independently, the complicated story, keeping everywhere to the same scheme, must have wandered from people to people. Or the ideas of the creation out of the primeval sea. All through Siberia similar beliefs are held, and it is strange that the

lays of Eastern Finland relate how a "daughter of the air" fell out of the sky and floated on those vast waters.

The volume offers fresh materials and suggestions to students of primitive religious ideas as of folklore. The lasting impressions are the unity of primitive ideas everywhere, and the tenacity of what was once religion and myth surviving as folklore.

REIDAR TH. CHRISTIANSEN

Oslo, Norway

---

*Le Couronnement de Renard, poème du treizième siècle.* Publié par ALFRED FOULET. Princeton University Press and the Presses Universitaires de France, 1929. Pp. lxxviii + 125. Elliott Monographs 24.

This edition of the *Couronnement de Renard* is an admirable piece of work and will of course replace the antiquated version published by Méon in 1826. The introduction lucidly sets forth the pertinent facts about the poem, its manuscript, date, sources, relations, influence and significance, and the notes at the end are competent and copious. Unlike Ulrich Leo, M. Foulet sees in the *Couronnement* not a general attack upon the democratic tendencies of the day, but a more personal satire inspired by hatred and distrust of the Mendicant Orders and designed by the author to warn the Marquis de Namur against the "renardie" inherent in their ranks. The poem is therefore a *fable symbolique*, which, like *Renard le Nouvel* and Rutebeuf's *Renard le Bétourné*, merely uses the *cadre* of the beast epic to point a contemporary moral. Because of its incidental illumination of the customs and manners of the day, because of its relation to the *Fables* of Marie de France and because of the humour of certain scenes and the proverbs they frequently incorporate, the poem has considerable general interest, more perhaps than the editor modestly claims for it. Its list of fabulous beasts, lines 1720-1822, which F. has cleverly traced to the unpublished *De natura rerum* of Thomas de Cantimpré (p. xl-xlvii), will also be of special service to those concerned with semantics, while students of the courtly romances will unexpectedly find several references to their heroes in lines 53, 106-9.

Particularly commendable in this edition are the portions devoted to the language of the poem. The editor suggestively indicates that author and scribe may have been one, but his technique in discussing the language of each, in treating separately their dialectal and non-dialectal peculiarities, is as conservative as it is revealing. A few further peculiarities might have been listed: *espeuse* (: *orgueilleuse*) 145; the *m* for *n* of *aucum* 180, *chascum* 998; the *i* before *n* *mouillée* in *sovine* 197 and *signour* or *signour*,



*passim*; the reduction of *ui* in *pist* 297, but these in no way affect F.'s conclusion that author and scribe wrote the literary French of the period with a certain admixture of northern and eastern forms. The Glossary is also worthy of note (should not *roumanchier* 1715 have been included?) and the device of classifying together in the introduction (p. lxxv) the types of corrections incorporated in the text is excellent. Although F. expressly disclaims any *fétichisme* in his devotion to the reading of his manuscript, he introduces relatively few changes and those are all of a nature that any good Bédierite can conscientiously approve. In short, this edition is a model of its kind and will be of service to all students in the field.<sup>1</sup>

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

### BRIEF MENTION

*Alexander Pope as Critic and Humanist.* By AUSTIN WARREN. (Princeton Studies in English, No. 1). Princeton University Press, 1929. x + 289 pp. The main conclusions reached by Professor Warren in his examination of Pope's literary criticism are not new, and few students of the eighteenth century will be inclined to take issue with him, save, perhaps, those who object to his placing of Pope above Addison in the ranks of the Augustan critics. But it is well that the whole body of Pope's work, and especially the pertinent passages in the correspondence, should have been examined from this point of view.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter is that dealing with Pope's edition of Shakespeare. Here Professor Warren successfully defends Pope from a number of Lounsbury's charges, and makes a more nearly just estimate of the value of Pope's editorial accomplishments. He also examines in some detail the nature of the passages which Pope marks as "most shining." No more illuminating exposition of the divergence of Pope's taste and his professed critical theories can be imagined. It is a pity that Professor Warren did not give a complete list of these marked passages: his summary indicates that they are not numerous enough to have overburdened his pages.

With the exception of this chapter the book might have been improved by condensation. The author, in his desire to be sure that no point is slighted, has included in his text much elementary material that might better have been relegated to the notes, and

<sup>1</sup> Only minor misprints have been noted: p. ix, line one, read *fran-* for *frn-*; p. xxviii, note 3, read *CFMA* for *CIFMA*; p. lxxv, the first of the *mots à supprimer* cannot be found in the line indicated.



some irrelevancies that could have been omitted altogether. This fault of style will perhaps irritate the reader who is already moderately familiar with Pope and his period. Such a reader, however, may turn to the index, which is now our most convenient key to Pope's critical opinions.

ARTHUR E. CASE.

Yale University.

---

*James Hogg, The Poetical Mirror.* Edited by T. EARLE WELBY. London: The Scholartis Press, 1929. Pp. xvi + 192. 8 sh. 6 d. Mr. Eric Partridge of The Scholartis Press is performing a useful service to scholarship and *belles lettres* through the publication of handsome but inexpensive reprints, mainly of inaccessible if not forgotten eighteenth- and nineteenth-century books. Hogg's parodies, originally issued in 1816, are little known and do not often appear in sales catalogues. One mimicks Byron, one Hogg himself, and the twelve others imitate his friends: Scott, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, and Professor Wilson. In a suggestive though slight introduction Mr. Welby points out that, whereas most good parodies unite reverence with mockery and exhibit "a lover's rage against that which in the beloved rebukes his adoration," yet in Hogg's best passages "the joke is not in any hinted comment" for they are very nearly what the poets themselves might have written. A curious illustration of this point is furnished by a letter to the *T.L.S.* of October 24 in which Mr. J. M. Turnbull shows that "The Flying Tailor," one of the parodies of Wordsworth, may deal with a person about whom Wordsworth wrote to Lamb. Accordingly, although *The Poetic Mirror* contains burlesque that is obvious and crude, and parody that mingles reverence with mockery, "it is not for criticism or for laughter that one goes to this book; it is for Hogg's finest gift, that gift of malign imagination." As to this last one may have doubts, for parts of H. C. Bunner's admirable "Home, Sweet Home" after the manner of Whitman are just the kind of parody Mr. Welby has in mind, yet they are free from malignity and are not distinguished by imagination.

R. D. H.

---

*The Fred Newton Scott Anniversary Papers.* By FORMER STUDENTS AND COLLEAGUES OF PROFESSOR SCOTT. University of Chicago Press, 1929. Pp. viii + 319. An anniversary volume most completely realizes itself when, in addition to recognizing the long and distinguished service of a scholar, it illustrates in the contributions themselves the genius of his teaching. The present volume is of such a character. Professor Rankin properly states in the Preface that "the footings and foundations for future

superstructure of psychologically full and precise analysis and interpretation of the phenomena of speech" are in Professor Scott's work. It is therefore to be expected that the majority of the fourteen papers will deal with stylistic problems, literary theory, and the nature of the aesthetic experience.

In a thoroughly matured paper, the *Approaches to Literary Theory*, Dr. Charles E. Whitmore evaluates the historical, psychological, and scientific approaches to the interpretation of Literature. This study can hardly be ignored by future students of literary theory. In a paper on *The Artist*, Mr. Lawrence H. Conrad advances the thesis that intuitions are not mysterious in their origin but are the products of artistic, as opposed to scientific, research, the character of this research being the ability of one gifted with imagination to project himself, under certain favorable conditions, into lower and higher forms of life; "that artistic research is a definite procedure, its steps as open to analysis as are the steps of scientific research; that the results of artistic research, if less reliable, are frequently more valuable than those of scientific research; and that there could be established without great difficulty a definite course of training that would lead to the acquisition of this ability." Turning to a more concrete paper, Professor Ada L. F. Snell, in *The Meter of 'Christabel'*, finds the much-discussed "new principle," which Coleridge speaks of in the famous note at the close of the Preface to *Christabel*, to consist in the "adding and subtracting light syllables in order to mold rhythms in harmony with different emotional impulses." Coleridge thus "inspired a new conception of metrical phenomena, turning poets now for over a century to fresh experimentations."

All of the contributions are worth reading, and several are of superior merit.

FREDERICK M. PADELFORD

---

*The Kailyard School of Fiction.* By ADA WALLACE ROBERTS. The Culver-Stockton Quarterly, Jan. pp. 1-36: April, pp. 39-58, 1929. An excellent short study of the Kailyarders. The author points out their relation to Scott, Galt, Stevenson and the contemporary literary taste, describes the literary qualities of their novels and short stories, criticizes the work of the best representatives of the so-called school, and finally discusses the significance of their work as a whole.

JAMES R. FOSTER

---

*Burns Poetry and Prose with Essays* by Mackenzie, Jeffrey, Carlyle and Others. With an Introduction and Notes by R. DEWAR. New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1929. Pp. xx + 203. \$1.25. Thirty pages of this volume are

devoted to selections from notable critical studies, forty to extracts from the poet's correspondence, thirty-eight to notes, and ninety-three to poems. For the prose selections and for Professor Dewar's admirable introduction there can be nothing but praise, but the presence of expurgated texts and mere snippets of the longer poems unfits it for use as a college text.

J. DELANCEY FERGUSON

---

*Selections from Old Testament Literature.* Edited by HENRY DAVID GRAY. With notes compiled by WALLACE J. VICKERS. New York, Macmillan, 1930. Pp. xvii + 706. \$3.00. Unlike most recent books of Old Testament selections for college study, this volume contains all the material for a somewhat extended course. It includes, for example, practically all of Job, thirty-eight Psalms, most of Ecclesiastes, twenty-three pages of Jeremiah, extracts from the late wisdom books of the Apocrypha, portions of the book of Enoch (important for Milton), and such late legends as Tobit, Judith, and Bel and the Dragon. The arrangement is partly by types (Early Narratives, Prophecy and History, Lyric Poetry, Dramatic Poetry, Didactic Poetry and Prose Essays, Romantic Stories) and partly chronological within these divisions. Some teachers may find it inconvenient to have the two stories of the flood separated by 306 pages, the priestly narratives of the creation and the deluge being in the middle of the book because of their late origin. The double principle of division likewise has the effect of putting Ruth next to Tobit, instead of in the Persian period in connection with the marriage reforms of Ezra. These and all similar dislocations are, however, amply explained in the introductions and notes, which are models of brevity and clearness. The general point of view is that of the latest critical scholarship.

The University of Rochester

JOHN R. SLATER

---

*About English Poetry.* By G. F. BRADBY. New York: Oxford University Press, 1929. In seventy-eight brief pages are described the interests and pleasures of the ordinary man in reading poetry. Significance, rhythm, melody, magic of words, these are the chief divisions of the discussion of what poetic beauty means. About the ordinary man's problem with the new verse forms there is only a paragraph or two, but along the beaten track the book is a simply and pleasantly written guide. It raises few questions for debate, and makes no pretense to be a contribution to aesthetics. Mr. Bradby's "admittedly loose definition" of poetry is characteristic of the informality of the volume: "Poetry is an emotional and metrical appeal to the understanding, which awakens in us, in some form or other, a consciousness of beauty." Obviously the interesting word here is "appeal," a helpful word in

distinguishing the poetic from the prosaic in any form of art. The definition is by no means a bad one. The illustrations are excellent, and contain no surprises.

Smith College.

R. A. RICE

*Four Studies in Wordsworth.* By MARIAN MEAD. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, 1929. When the first of these studies on "Wordsworth's Eye" appeared in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association* the author was hailed not only as a true Wordsworthian but as the first thorough student of what most Wordsworthians have always recognised to be a key to the poet's method and doctrine, his gradual discipline of his visionary power. The reprinting of this paper, with the new and far longer one on "Light and Colour in Wordsworth," furnishes us with a definitive exhibition of the nature of Wordsworth's "eye-mindedness." There is not a great deal of comparison with other descriptive poets, though an appendix displays a list of light and colour words in both Wordsworth and Keats, words which they used in common and words peculiar to each. The character of the whole study is literalness, but it is of an informing kind. One wonders at the patience that will count and sort the colours in so vast a canvas as Wordsworth's complete poems. Has any one ever measured the square inches of yellow and blue in Constable? It none the less means something to ascertain, what might well be suspected, that in Wordsworth effects of greenness and whiteness are those most frequently noted (because most frequent in nature?), effects of red next (because in landscape it is the most striking colour?), and that blue, grey, and yellow are practically on a par. This enumeration, it is only fair to add, is relegated to a footnote. Also his favorite words are discussed. He used *glitter* seventy-eight times. "We do not feel that we really know our friends," says Miss Mead, "until we know their particular tastes, even their whims. These individual characteristics cannot be dissociated from the sum of the physical, intellectual, and moral nature of even a great poet; the nature which, joined with his own peculiar experience, makes his poetry his own and no other's."

Miss Mead has not cared, apropos of such investigations, to make up her own formula for the poet's prescriptive philosophy. Little is added in the way of another moral to the critical tale. Her skill lies in the exhibition of passages. Nor does she, in her study of Wordsworth's intention in the "Idiot Boy," have any very striking opinion of her own to offer, and no opinion on the recent academic controversies about the poem. The fourth paper deals with what Wordsworth records on the subject of homes and home life.

Smith College

R. A. RICE

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received.]

Arns, K., Aronstein, Ph., Becking, G., Bornhausen, K., Friebel, K., Levy, H., Mackensen, L., Scheidt, W. und Wahle, E. (eds.).—Handbuch der Englandkunde. Zweiter Teil. *Frankfurt am Main*: Diesterweg, 1929. Pp. xii + 370. (Handbücher der Auslandskunde, Band 2.)

Baldwin, Howard M., Creek, Herbert LeS., and McKee, James H.—A Handbook of Modern Writing. *New York*: Macmillan, 1930. Pp. xxiii + 378.

Barnard, E. A. B.—New Links with Shakespeare. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1930. Pp. xiv + 135. \$4.00.

Bröker, Hugo.—Zu den Lautverhältnissen der Lancashire-Dialekte. *Berlin*: Mayer & Müller, 1930. Pp. iv + 54.

Coulter, Vincil C. and Law, Lois.—Manual and Exercise Books for First Year College English. *New York*: Ronald Press, 1930. Pp. vi + 110. \$1.00.

Fulton, Maurice G.—Charles Lamb in Essays and Letters. *New York*: Macmillan, 1930. Pp. xviii + 350. \$1.90.

Garwood, Irving.—Heath Manual of the Literature of England. *Boston*: Heath, 1930. Pp. x + 256.

Grabo, Carl.—A Newton Among Poets. *Chapel Hill*: University of North Carolina Press, 1930. Pp. xiv + 208. \$3.00.

Häfele, Karl.—Die Godivasage und ihre Behandlung in der Literatur. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929. Pp. xii + 314. (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 66).

Hübener, Gustav.—England und die Ge-sittungsgrundlage der europäischen Früh-geschichte. *Frankfurt am Main*: Diesterweg, 1930. Pp. vi + 326.

Jespersen, Otto.—A Grammatical Miscellany Offered to Otto Jespersen on his Seventieth Birthday. *Copenhagen*: Levin & Munksgaard, 1930. Pp. 464.

Kelley, Maurice.—Additional Chapters on Thomas Cooper. *Orono, Maine*: University Press, 1930. Pp. 92. (University of Maine Studies, Second Series, No. 15).

Latham, Minor White.—The Elizabethan Fairies: The Fairies of Folklore and the Fairies of Shakespeare. *New York*: Columbia University Press, 1930. Pp. viii + 313. \$3.75.

Mawer, A. and Stenton, F. M. With the

assistance of J. E. B. Gover.—The Place-Names of Sussex, Parts I and II. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1929-30. Vol. VI, pp. xlv + 249. Vol. VII, pp. vii + 613. \$12.00 per set. (English Place-Name Society, Vols. VI-VII).

Nicolson, Marjorie H.—Conway Letters. *New Haven*: Yale University Press, Pp. xxviii + 518. \$6.00.

Poole, E. Phillips (ed.).—Lady Julia Mandeville by Frances Brooke. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1930. Pp. 220. 8 s. 6 d.

Rollins, Hyder Edward (ed.).—The Pepys Ballads. Vol. IV, 1688-1689, Numbers 164-253. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1930. Pp. xv + 353. \$3.50.

Scherer, Günther.—Zur Geographie und Chronologie des angelsächsischen Wortschatzes. *Weimar*: G. Uschmann. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1928. Pp. iv + 62.

Schütt, Marie.—Die englische Biographik der Tudor-Zeit. *Hamburg*: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, & Co., 1930. Pp. 162. RM 10.

Shannon, Edgar F.—Chaucer and the Roman Poets. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1929. Pp. xxii + 402. \$4.00 (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, VII).

Stoll, Elmer Edgar.—Poets and Playwrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Spenser, Milton. *Minneapolis*: University of Minnesota Press, 1930. Pp. viii + 304. \$3.00.

Tannenbaum, Samuel A., and Rollins, Hyder E. (eds.).—The Drinking Academy, A Play by Thomas Randolph. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1930. Pp. xxv + 64. \$2.50.

Tillyard, E. M. W.—Milton. *New York*: Dial Press, 1930. Pp. viii + 396. \$5.00.

Vinaver, E. and Gray, H. J. B. (eds.).—Arthuriana. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1930. Pp. 70. 4 s. 6 d. (Arthurian Society I).

West, Victor Royce.—Folklore in the Works of Mark Twain. *Lincoln, Nebraska*: 1930. Pp. ii + 88. (University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature, and Criticism, No. 10).

Wildi, Max.—Arthur Symons als Kritiker der Literatur. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929. Pp. 146. M. 7.50 (Anglistische Forschungen 67).

## GERMAN

Abraham a Santa Clara.—Neun neue Predigten von Abraham a Santa Clara. Aus der Wiener Hs. cod. 11571. Mit 2 Handschriftenproben. Hrsg. von Karl Bertsche. [Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jh. Nr. 278-281.] *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1930. xx, 178 pp. M. 4.



Alexis, Joseph E. A. and Pfeiler, Wilhelm K.—In Deutschland. *Lincoln, Neb.*: Midwest Book Co. [1930]. ix, 311 pp. \$1.44.

Altwater, Friedr.—Wesen und Form der deutschen Dorfgeschichte im 19. Jh. [Germanische Studien. H. 88]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1930. 204 pp. M. 8.

Baeseke, Georg.—Der deutsche Abrogans und die Herkunft des deutschen Schrifttums. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1930. xii, 171 pp., 18 plates. 4°. M. 36.

Blümel, Rudolf.—Der neuhochdeutsche Rhythmus in Dichtung und Prosa. [German. Bibliothek. Abt. 2, Bd. 29]. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1930. vi, 176 pp. M. 5.50.

Bülbring, Maud.—Zur Vorgeschichte der mittelniederländischen Epik. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung der Kampfformeln. *Bonn*: Kurt Schroeder, 1930. 231 pp. M. 9.50.

Campbell, Thomas Moody.—German Plays of the Nineteenth Century. Ed. with Introduction and Notes. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1930. 437 pp., large 8° \$4.00.

Castle, Eduard.—Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Nach dem Tode von J. W. Nagl und J. Zeidler hrsg. von —. Bd. 3 (Schluss). 1848-1918. Abt. 7. *Wien*: C. Fromme, 1930. Pp. 961-1112. M. 8.40.

Collitz, Hermann.—Studies in Honor of —. Presented by a group of his pupils and friends on the occasion of his 75th birthday. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930. xii, 331 pp. \$5.00.

Dollinger, Hermann.—Die dramatische Handlung in Klopstocks "Der Tod Adams" und Gerstenbergs "Ugolino" [Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, Bd. 29]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1930. 51, 12 pp., 3 tables. M. 4.

Eloesser, Arthur.—Die deutsche Literatur vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart. Bd. I: Bis zu Goethes Tod. *Berlin*: Bruno Cassirer, 1930. x, 671 pp. 4°.

Fleissner, O. S. and E. M.—Deutschland von heute und gestern. Ein Lesebuch der deutschen Volkskunde. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1930. xii, 279 pp. \$1.75.

Flothuis, M. H.—Einfache kurzgefasste deutsche Syntax. *Groningen*: P. Noordhoff, 1930. viii, 153 pp. F. 2.75.

Freiburg-Rüter, Klemens.—Der literarische Kritiker Karl Gutzkow. Eine Studie über Form, Gehalt und Wirkung seiner Kritik. [Form und Geist, Arbeiten zur germ. Philologie, Bd. 15]. *Leipzig*: H. Eichblatt, 1930. 200 pp. M. 8.60.

Frühbrodt, Gerhard.—Der Impressionismus in der Lyrik der Annette von Droste-Hül-

hoff. [Neue Forschung 7]. *Berlin*: Junker u. Dünhaupt, 1930. x, 154 pp. 4°. M. 8.

Gessner, Salomon. 1730-1930. Gedenkbuch zum 200. Geburtstag hrsg. vom Lesezirkel Hottingen von Gessners Vaterstadt. *Zürich, Leipzig*: Grethlein & Co. in Komm., 1930. vi, 164 pp. 4°. M. 8.

Gilbert, Mary Enole.—Das Gespräch in Fontanes Gesellschaftsromanen [Palaestra, 174]. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1930. vii, 188 pp. M. 13.

Grauheer, Josepha, und Arens, Eduard.—Die Poetische Schusterinnung an der Leine. [Göttingische Nebenstunden, 7.] *Göttingen*: Otto Deneke, 1929. ii, 61 pp. M. 2.

Grolman, Adolf v.—Literarische Betrachtung. Beiträge zur Praxis der Anschauung von Künstlerschicksal und Kunstform [Neue Forschung, 6]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1930. 138 pp. 4°. M. 8.

Grundy, J. B. C.—Tieck and Runge. A Study in the relationship of literature and art in the romantic period with especial reference to "Franz Sternbald." [Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte, H. 270]. *Strassburg*: J. H. E. Heitz, 1930. ix, 111 pp. 4°. M. 12.

Haack, H.—Die Pfarrergestalten bei Gerhart Hauptmann [Studien zur Geschichte des ev. Pfarrerstandes. H. 6.] *Berlin*: M. Warneck, 1930. 40 pp. M. 2.

Hübner, Alfred.—Die "mittelhochdeutsche Ironie" oder die Litotes im Altdeutschen. [Palaestra, 170]. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1930. viii, 210 pp. M. 15.

Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft. Hrsg. von Karl Glossy. Jg. 29. *Wien*: Amalthea-Verl., 1930. 157 pp. M. 6.

Jockisch, Walther.—Andreas Gryphius und das literarische Barock [Germanische Studien, H. 89]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1930. 87 pp. M. 3.80.

Kayser, Rudolf.—Dichterköpfe. *Wien*: Phaidon-Verlag, 1930. 205 pp. M. 3.50.

Köhn, Anna.—Das weibliche Schönheitsideal in der ritterlichen Dichtung [Form und Geist, Bd. 14]. *Leipzig*: H. Eichblatt, 1930. 116 pp. M. 5.60.

Kriedte, Horst.—Deutsche Bibelfragmente in Prosa des 12. Jhs. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1930. 167 pp. M. 10.

Kuhn, Walter.—Die jungen deutschen Sprachinseln in Galizien. [Deutschtum und Ausland, H. 26/27]. *Münster*: Aschendorff, 1930. xi, 244 pp., 1 plate. M. 12.30.

Langenbacher, Hellmuth.—Das Gesicht des deutschen Minnesangs und seine Wandlungen. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1930. vii, 95 pp. M. 5.50.

Lexner, Matthias.—Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch. 19., überarbeitete Aufl.



Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1930. viii, 343 pp. Large 8°. M. 10.

Maier, Hans.—Die Flurnamen der Gemarkung Villingen. [Aus Schriften des Vereins für Gesh. u. Naturgesch. d. Baar, H. 17. 1928]. *Donauöschingen*: 1929. 113 pp. M. 1.80.

Malthan, Paul.—Das Junge Deutschland und das Lustspiel [Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte N. F. 14]. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1930. 151 pp. M. 9.

Maschek, Harald.—Umland als Schwabe [Prager deutsche Studien, H. 44]. *Reichenberg i. B.*: Sudetendeutscher Verl. F. Kraus, 1930. 61 pp. M. 2.25.

Müller-Wehinger, Jos.—Studien zur Dialektgeographie des Saargawes. [Rheinisches Archiv, 13]. *Bonn*: L. Röhrscheid, 1930. viii, 117 pp. M. 11.

Naumann, Hans.—Das Bild Walthers von der Vogelweide. (Versuch, dem eine Rede zugrunde liegt.) [Schriften der Strassburger wissenschaftl. Gesellschaft an der Univ. Frankfurt a. M. N. F. H. 12.] *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1930. 28 pp. 4° M. 3.

Nitchie, Elizabeth; Goodloe, Jane; Hawes, Marion, and McCann, Grace L.—Pens for Ploughshares. A Bibliography of Creative Literature that encourages World Peace. *Boston*: F. W. Faxon Co., 1930. 106 pp. \$1.50.

Oppermann, Wilh.—Aus dem Leben unsrer Muttersprache. Eine Einführung in das Verständnis deutscher Sprache und deutscher Art. Zweite, verb. und erw. Auflage. *Leipzig*: F. Brandstetter, 1928. xii, 193 pp. M. 6.50.

Pattou, E. E.—An American in Germany. Rev. ed. *Boston*: Heath [1930]. viii, 212 pp.

Prokosch, E.—Deutsche Sprachlehre. *New York*: Holt [1930]. ix, 340 pp. \$1.60.

Ripman, W.—A new German Grammar with exercises. *London*: J. M. Dent & Sons [1930]. 152 pp. \$0.95.

Rose, Ernst.—Deutsche Dichtung unsrer Zeit. Von der Sinnenkunst zur Seelenkunst (1880-1930) Ausgewählt und mit Einleitungen versehen. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, 1930. xi, 545 pp. \$2.75.

Ritter, Heinz.—Novalis' Hymnen an die Nacht. Ihre Deutung nach Inhalt und Aufbau auf textkritischer Grundlage [Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte. H. 13]. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1930. vii, 172 pp. M. 10.

Stettner, Leo.—Das philosophische System Shaftesburys und Wielands Agathon. [Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, Bd. 28]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1930. vii, xx, 189 pp. M. 8.

Urschriften, Zwei, der "Imitatio Christi" (von Thomas a Kempis) in mittelniederdeutschen Übersetzungen. Aus Lübecker Handschriften hrsg. von Paul Hagen [Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, Bd. 34]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1930. xxviii, 95 pp. 4°. M. 10.

Vimarensia für Max Hecker. überreicht zum 60. Geburtstag. *Weimar*: H. Böhlau Nachf., 1930. 77 pp. M. 4.

Volhard, Ewald.—F. M. Klingers philosophische Romane. Der Einzelne und die Gesellschaft. [Hermæa, 27.] *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1930. xv, 158 pp. M. 7.50.

Vrijdaghs, P., and Ripman, W.—Short Stories by Modern German authors, selected and edited. *London*: J. M. Dent & Sons [1930]. 197 pp. \$0.90.

Wagner, Annemarie.—Unbedeutende Reimwörter und Enjambement bei Rilke und in der neueren Lyrik [Mnemosyne, H. 5]. *Bonn*: L. Röhrscheid, 1930. 238 pp. M. 8.

## FRENCH

A la Mémoire d'E. Roy.—*Paris*: Picard, 1929. xxiii + 73 pp. (Pubs. de l'Univ. de Dijon.)

Ambière, J.—J. du Bellay. *Paris*: Firmin-Didot, 1930. 203 pp. Fr. 15.

Antoine, Thérive, etc.—L'oeuvre théâtral de Duhamel; la Prose de Duhamel, etc. *Paris*: Eds. du Capitole, 1929. 319 pp.

Ascoli, G.—La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. 2 vols. *Paris*: Gamber, 1930. 360 + 517 pp.

Beeson, C. H.—Lupus of Ferrières as scribe and text critic. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Mediaeval Academy, 1930. x + 52 pp. + 109 facsimiles. \$12.

Benéteau, A.—Etude sur l'inspiration et l'influence de P. Verlaine. Diss. Catholic Univ.. *Washington*: 1930. x + 200 pp.

Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube.—Girart de Vienne, ed. F. G. Yeandle. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1930. vii + 249 pp. \$3.00.

Bissell, C. H.—Les Conventions du théâtre bourgeois contemporain en France, 1887-1914. U. of California diss. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1930. xii + 189 pp.

Boillot, F.—Le vrai ami du traducteur anglais-fr. et fr.-angl. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1930. 266 pp.

Boll, L. L.—The Relation of Diu Krône of Heinrich von dem Türlin to La Mule sanz Frein. Diss. *Washington*: Catholic Univ., 1929. xiv + 125 pp.

Crébillon fils.—Lettres de la marquise de M. au comte de R. *Paris*: Le Divan, 1930. 268 pp. Fr. 30.

Cross, T. P. and Nitze, W. A.—Lancelot and Guenevere, a Study on the origines of Courtly Love. *Chicago*: Univ. Press, 1930. vii + 104 pp.

Damourette et Pichon.—Des mots à la pensée, essai de grammaire de la langue fr. T. I. *Paris*: D'Artrey, 1930. 674 pp.

Dandieu, A.—Marcel Proust, sa révélation psychologique. *Paris*: Firmin-Didot, 1930. 208 pp. \$1.50.

Downer and Knickerbocker.—A First Fr. course. *New York*: Appleton, 1930. xii + 436 pp.

Dubrule, N.—Deuxième livre de fr. *Boston*: Ginn, 1930. xii + 402 pp. \$1.40.

—Héros et héroïnes de France. *Ibid.*, 1930. viii + 194 pp. \$1.00.

Faral, E.—La Légende arthurienne. 3 tomes. *Paris*: Champion, 1929. iv + 319 + ii + 463 + iii + 391 pp. (Bibl. de l'Ec. des hautes études.)

Ford, H. E. and Hicks, R. K.—A new Fr. reader. *New York*: Holt, 1930. xviii + 194 + xvi pp. \$1.20.

France, A.—Le livre de mon ami, ed. F. B. Barton. *Boston*: Heath, 1930. xiv + 226 pp.

Gautier.—Le Capitaine Fracasse, ed. F. E. Guyer. *New York*: Century, 1930. xviii + 215 pp. \$1.35.

Gavel, H.—Grammaire basque. T. I. Phonétique. *Paris*: Champion, 1930. 288 pp. Fr. 35.

Gottschalk, P. W.—Die sprichwörtlichen Redesarten der franz. Sprache. T. II. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1930. v + 266 pp.

Guimbaud, L.—La mère de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Plon, 1930. 312 pp. Fr. 15.

Handbuch der Frankreichkunde, herausg. v. P. Hartig u. W. Schellberg mit Beiträgen v. Hatzfeld, Lerch, Schürr, Neubert, etc. 2 vols. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1930. x + 324 + xv + 538 pp.

Hawkins, R. L.—Mme de Staël and the United States. *Cambridge*: Harvard Press, 1930. vi + 81 pp. (Harvard Studies in Romance Langs.)

Hugo.—Les Travailleurs de la mer, ed. A. H. Moser. *Boston*: Ginn, 1930. xv + 215 pp. \$0.72.

Jones, W. K. and D. da Cruz.—Five Spanish plays for study and stage. *New York*: Macmillan, 1930. xii + 242 pp. \$1.30.

Keeler, Sœur M. J.—Etude sur la poésie et sur le vocab. de L. Papon, poète forézien du XVI<sup>e</sup> s. Diss. *Washington*: Catholic Univ., 1930. xiv + 105 pp.

La Fayette, Mme de.—La Princesse de Clèves, ed. H. Ashton. *New York*: Scribner's, 1930. xxx + 208 pp. \$1.00.

Le Brète.—Aimer quand même, ed. C. F. Zeek. *Boston*: Heath, 1930. x + 233 pp.

Lefèvre, F.—Une heure avec . . . Careo, de Noailles, Clemenceau, etc. *Paris*: Galimard, 1929. 295 pp.

Lefranc, J.—Bougainville et ses compagnons. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1929. 256 pp. Fr. 15.

Lemonnier, L.—Enquêtes sur Baudelaire. *Paris*: Crès, 1929. 133 pp.

Marie de France.—The Lays of Gugemar, Lanval and a fragment of Yonec, with a study of the life and work of the author, by Julian Harris. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1930. 159 pp.

Marot.—Œuvres, t. IV, éd. G. Guiffrey, mise au jour . . . par J. Plattard. *Paris*: Schemit, 1929. 454 pp.

Mazade, F.—Anthologie des poètes fr. 2 vols. *Paris*: Libr. de France, 1928. 408 + 408 pp.

Neri, F.—La Sorte del Rotrou. *Turin*: V. Bona, 1930. 35 pp.

Ogden, A. and C. C. Webster.—Thirty lessons on Fr. idioms. *New York*: Century, 1930. vii + 172 pp. \$1.25.

Pergaud, L.—Histoires de bêtes. *Chicago*: U. of Chicago Press, 1930. x + 100 pp. \$1.15.

Polinger, E. H.—Pierre Charles Roy, playwright and satirist (1683-1784). *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1930. xiv + 367 pp.

Richardson, Lula M.—The Forerunners of Feminism in Fr. Lit. of the Renaissance from Christine of Pisa to Marie de Gournay. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1929. 178 pp. (J. H. Studies in Romance L. and L.)

Rolland, Romain.—Jean Christophe (Antoinette), ed. H. W. Church. *New York*: Holt, 1930. xxvi + 148 + xlviii pp.

Schwarz, H. S.—Histoire gaies. *Boston*: 1930. ix + 198 pp.

Scudéry, G. de.—La Mort de César, repub. with introd. by H. L. Cook. *New York*: 1930. 78 pp. \$1.00.

Van Tieghem, P.—Tendances nouvelles en histoire littéraire. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1930. 66 pp. (Etudes fr.)

Villon.—The Works of François V., trans. and ed. by Geoffrey Atkinson. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1930. 293 pp.

## ITALIAN

Alberti, Leon Battista.—Della famiglia. Precede uno scritto del De Sanctis su L. B. Alberti. *La Santa (Milano)*: Notari, ist. edit. italiano edit. tip., 1928. 315 pp. (I capolavori della letteratura italiana.)

**Alfieri, Vittorio.**—Autobiografia. Preceduta da un discorso di E. Panzacchi e seguita dalla lettera dell'abate di Caluso intorno alla morte dell'autore. *La Santa (Milano)*: Notari ist. edit. italiano edit. tip., 1928. 434 pp. (I capolavori della letteratura italiana.)

**Belloni, A.**—Il Seicento. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1929. xii + 606 pp. L. 60. (Storia letteraria d'Italia; terza edizione completamente rifatta.)

**Boccaccio, Giovanni.**—Il Decamerone. Con uno studio di A. Bartoli. Vol. I, II e III. *La Santa (Milano)*: Notari, ist. edit. italiano edit. tip., 1928. 3 vols., 349, 297, 279 pp. (I capolavori della letteratura italiana.)

**Boiscarino, V.**—Enrico Thovez. *Pisa*: Nistri-Lischi, 1929. 173 pp. L. 8.

**Bruscaglioni, A.**—La tragedia "Iephtes" di G. Buchanan (1506-1582) e la sua traduzione italiana per opera di S. Bargagli senese (1540-1612). *Sondrio*: Arti graf. Valtellinesi, 1929. 16 pp.

**D'Azeglio, Massimo** [Taparelli].—I miei ricordi. Vol. I e II. *Milano*: f.lli Treves, 1929. 2 vols., xii + 287, 294 pp. L. 11. (Biblioteca amena, no. 1021-22.)

**D'Ovidio, F.**—Varietà critiche. Studi sul Leopardi; il Furioso e il Don Chisciotte; pei plagiaristi del Tolomei, ecc. *Caserta*: Casa edit. moderna, 1929. 335 pp. L. 20. (Opera complete di F. D'Ovidio, no. 12.)

**Giusso, L.**—Il viandante e le statue. *Milano*: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1929. 307 pp. L. 12. (Cultura contemporanea: biblioteca di letteratura, storia e filosofia, no. 25.)

**Goggio, E.**—Six Easy Italian Plays. With notes, exercises, and vocabulary. *Boston*: Heath, 1930. v + 245 pp. \$1.30. (Heath's Modern Language Series.)

**Grison, P.**—Studio interpretativo ed etimologico sopra le iscrizioni preromane di Magrè e d'altri luoghi del Veneto: Piovene, Colli Berici, Padova, Feltre e sopra un'altra strana iscrizione di Montebelluna di Crosara. *Venezia*: Arti graf. "Scledensi," 1928. 44 pp. L. 3.

**Gustarelli, A.**—Alessandro Manzoni. Note biografiche. Riassunto de "I promessi sposi" ed analisi estetica di episodi scelti. Riassunti ed analisi delle "liriche" e delle "tragedie." *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1928. 181 pp. L. 9. (Quaderni di analisi estetica.)

**Hoare, A.**—An Italian Phrase-book. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1930. vii + 120 pp. \$1.00.

**Leonardo da Vinci.**—Scritti. Con un proemio di L. Beltrami. *La Santa (Milano)*: Notari, ist. edit. italiano edit. tip., 1929.

231 pp. (I capolavori della letteratura italiana.)

**Machiavelli, Niccolò.**—Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio. Vol. I e II. *La Santa (Milano)*: Notari, ist. edit. italiano edit. tip., 1928. 2 vols., 295, 280 pp. (I capolavori della letteratura italiana; opere di N. M., no. 1 e 3.)

—Il principe. Lettera a Francesco Vettori del 10 dicembre 1513. Ritratti di cose di Francia e della Magna. La vita di Castruccio Castracani. Testi nuovamente riveduti sui codici e sulle stampe e stabiliti criticamente da M. Casella, seguiti dalle interpretazioni di Ugo Foscolo, Giuseppe Ferrari, Francesco De Sanctis, Alfredo Oriani e Benito Mussolini. *Milano*: Libr. d'Italia, 1929. 524 pp.

**Natali, G.**—Il Settecento. Parte I e II. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1929. 2 vols., viii + 642, vi + 643-1243. L. 65, 60. (Storia letteraria d'Italia; terza edizione completamente rifatta.)

**Parini, Giuseppe.**—Poesie. Con uno studio di G. Mazzoni. *La Santa (Milano)*: Notari, ist. edit. italiano edit. tip., 1929. 290 pp. (I capolavori della letteratura italiana.)

**Petronio, G.**—Giosuè Carducci. L'uomo e il poeta. *Messina*: G. D'Anna, 1930. vi + 145 pp. L. 12.

**Purves, J.**—A First Book of Italian Verse. Selected and arranged with notes and vocabulary. *London*: Oliver & Boyd, 1930. xxviii + 204 pp. 6 sh.

**Ragonesi, G.**—Nella vita e nel sogno. *Savona*: P. Lodola, 1929. 206 pp. L. 8.

**Rava, L.**—Lord Byron e P. B. Shelley a Ravenna e Teresa Guiccioli Gamba. Note *Roma*: Soc. naz. "Dante Alighieri," 1929. 212 pp.

**Scarlatti, A.** [Mascaretti, C.]—Et ab hic et ab hoc. IX: Le malattie del linguaggio. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1930. v + 266 pp. L. 10.

**Sterpa, M.**—Le "Grazie" di U. Foscolo. Saggio critico-estetico. *Catania*: Tip. Coniglione e Giuffrida, 1930. 444 pp. L. 20.

**Tassoni, Alessandro.**—La secchia rapita. L'oceano e le rime. A cura di G. Rossi. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1930. 382 pp. L. 30. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 125.)

**Tedesco, S.**—Vittorio Locchi e La sagra di Santa Gorizia. Dante: Farinata e Cavalcanti. *Palermo*: Ind. tip. "La Commerciale," 1929. 54 pp.

**Tilgher, A.**—La poesia dialettale napoletana; 1880-1930. *Roma*: Libreria di scienze e lettere, 1930. 105 pp. L. 9.

**Toffanin, G.**—Il Cinquecento. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1929. xviii + 667 pp. L. 65.

(Storia letteraria d'Italia; terza edizione completamente rifatta.)

**Tonelli, L.**—*Petrarca*. Milano: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1929. 374 pp. L. 15. (Cultura contemporanea: biblioteca di letteratura, storia e filosofia, no. 28.)

**Tozzi, F.**—*Realtà di ieri e di oggi*. Con prefazione di G. Fanciulli. Milano: Ediz. "Alpes," 1928. xxiii + 346 pp. L. 20.

**Vandelli, G.**—*Un autografo della Teseide* (Laurenziana; doni e acquisti, 305). Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1929. 16 pp. (Repr. fr. "Studi di filologia italiana," bullettino della r. Accademia della Crusca, II.)

**Venturini, Maria.**—*Vita ed attività dello "Scriptorium" veronese nel secolo XI*. Verona: "La tipografica veronese," 1930. ix + 132 pp.

**Veio, E.**—*Roma popolaresca*. Roma: Casa edit. "Optima," 1929. 164 pp. L. 10.

**Vinciguerra, M.**—*Purgatorio*. Palermo: Ediz. del "Ciclope," 1929. 97 pp. L. 10. (Quaderni del rinnovamento, no. 7.)

**Vittorini, D.**—*The Modern Italian Novel*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930. x + 296 pp. \$3.00.

### SPANISH

**Baroja, P.**—*Las inquietudes de Shanti Andía*, ed. L. D. Bailiff and M. B. Jones. Chicago: Univ. Press, 1930. 222 pp.

**Cantar de mio Cid**, el, trans. M. Sherwood. New York: Longmans, Green, 1930. xiii + 156 pp. \$2.50.

**Carrión and Aza.**—*Two Spanish plays, El Chaleco blanco and El Sueño dorado*, ed. J. Cano and E. Goggio. New York: Holt, 1930. xii + 132 + xlv pp. \$0.96.

**Chmelíček, H.**—*Die Gerundialumschreibung im Altspanischen zum Ausdruck von Aktionsarten*. Hamburg: Seminar für romanische Sprachen und Kultur, 1930. viii + 102 pp. (Hamburger Studien zu Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen, 5.)

**Daireaux, M.**—*Littérature hispano-américaine*. Paris: Kra, 1930. Fr. 20.

**Fink, H.**—*Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens*. 2. Band in Verbindung mit K. Beyerle und G. Schreiber herausgegeben von —. Münster: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930. 402 pp. (Spanische Forschungen der Goeresgesellschaft, hrsg. von ihrem Spanischen Kuratorium K. Beyerle, H. Finke, G. Schreiber, Reihe I, Bd. 2.)

**Mérimée and Morley.**—*History of Spanish Literature*. New York: Holt, 1930. 635 pp.

**Morley, S. G.**—*Lope de Vega's Peregrino lists*. Berkeley: U. of Cal. Press, 1930. 22 pp. (U. of Cal. pubs. in mod. philology.)

**Richardson, H. B.**—*An Etymological Vocabulary to the Libro de buen amor of Juan Ruiz, arcipreste de Hita*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1930. ix + 251 pp. (Yale Romanic Studies, II.)

**Sofer, J.**—*Lateinisches und romanisches aus den Etymologiae des Isidorus von Sevilla*. Untersuchungen zur lateinischen und romanischen Dorkunde. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1930. xii + 190 pp.

**Stephenson, Mary**—*Dent's elementary Sp. reader*. London: Dent, 1930. 144 pp.

**Tamayo y Baus.**—*Ura Apuesta and Huyendo del perejil*. Edited with introduction, notes, direct-method exercises and vocabulary, by Cony Sturgis and Juanita C. Robinson. New York: Macmillan, 1930. ix + 103 pp. \$1.00.

**Zangara, M.**—*La "Nochebuena" di M. J. de Larra*. Riflessi orazioni e motivi personali. Catania: Studio edit. moderno, 1928. 27 pp. L. 3.

### GENERAL

**Brereton, C.**—*Modern language teaching*. London: Univ. of London Press, 1930. xvi + 279 pp. 7/6.

**Cargill, O.**—*Drama and Liturgy*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1930. x + 151 pp. \$2.50.

**Danish Theses for the Doctorate, 1836-1926**, ed. by the University library. London: Oxford Press, 1929. xvi + 395 pp. \$7.50.

**Denison, J. H.**—*The Enlargement of Personality*. New York: Scribner's, 1930. xxii + 328 pp. \$3.00.

**Kürz, L.**—*Der naturlautliche Ursprung von Sprach und Schrift aus sumerischen, aegyptischen und chinesischen Schriftbildern*. Leipzig: R. Hadl, 1930. xii + 179 pp.

**Lindquest, L.**—*A laboratory course in general language*. I and II. New York: Holt, 1929. 134 + 156 pp.

— *Manual and Key*. I and II. *Ibid.*, 1929. 83 pp.

**Memorandum on the Teaching of Modern Languages**, issued by the associated assistant masters of secondary schools. London: Univ. of London Press, 1929. 236 pp. 4 s.

**Philosophie der Literaturwissenschaft**, herausgegeben von E. Ermatinger. Berlin: Junker u. Dümhaupt, 1930. 478 pp.

**Stephenson, N. W.**—*Nelson W. Aldrich, a Leader in American Politics*. New York: Scribner's, 1930. 496 pp. \$5.00.

**Walde und Hofmann.**—*Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. 80 pp. M. 1.50.

# READINGS IN DESCRIPTION AND NARRATION

*Chosen by*

R. A. BEALS : M. E. BARNICLE : J. S. TERRY

*Washington Square College, New York University*

A book with a  
method and purpose

**T**HIS collection of readings, the outcome of the experience of three teachers, is planned for use in one semester of the freshman rhetoric course. It begins with definite, clear-cut illustrations of simple incident, anecdote, and fable; progressing through varieties of specialized description, vignette, dialogue, character sketch, and state of mind; and culminating in the fully developed episode, autobiographical narrative, and short story, in which all the preceding types of narrative and description are used.

Ready in  
October

The selection offers great variety in length, subject matter, and style, having been chosen from the works of such diverse writers as Captain Marryat, George Borrow, Charles Dickens, Robert Louis Stevenson, Norman Douglas, Sacheverell Sitwell, Edward Thomas, Cunninghame Graham, Sir James M. Barrie, W. H. Hudson, John Galsworthy, and John Masefield.

200  
selections

Most of the narrative is written in the first person upon subjects within the range of the student's interest and experience, and the descriptive passages also suggest subjects close to his own life.

The English of the passages is flexible, easy, natural and in every style from the most workmanlike realism to poetic prose. The book contains new material chiefly. It is stimulating, provocative, and eminently readable and usable.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

Dallas

Atlanta

San Francisco



# THE WORKS OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE

*Edited by* PROF. R. H. CASE

Editor of "*The Arden Shakespeare*"

**T**HE DIAL PRESS takes pleasure in announcing a new and complete critical edition, under the supervision of Professor R. H. Case, of the Works of Christopher Marlowe, an undertaking which has long been awaited, and for which the services of such well-known Marlowe scholars as Professor C. F. Tucker Brooke and Dr. F. S. Boas have been secured. The edition will be completed in not more than seven volumes, of which the following two are now ready:

## The Life of Christopher Marlowe, and The Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage

*By* C. F. TUCKER BROOKE

*Professor of English in Yale University*

\$4.00

A scholarly edition of "Dido" is preceded in this volume by a life of the author, which is the first attempt to explain his career and personality integrally in the light of all the new facts that have recently been discovered. It contains also much new information about the poet's family, and shows his social background to have been better than has been supposed. New conclusions are presented concerning his relations to the dramatic companies and to Kyd and Baines. The circumstances of his death are set forth in all possible detail, and an appendix gives the pertinent documents in full.

## Tamburlaine I and II

*Edited by* U. M. ELLIS FERMOR, M.A., B.LITT.

*Bedford College, London*

*With 2 illustrations*

\$4.00

This edition is based on the 1590 octavo and is the first to include the readings of the recently discovered 1597 octavo. The introduction describes the spread of the Timur legend through Europe until it reached Marlowe in the versions of Pedro Mexia, Petrus Perondinus, and others. Marlowe's interpretation of these is described and also the use made by him of certain of the maps in Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, one of which is reproduced as the frontispiece.

**LINCOLN MACVEAGH**

THE DIAL PRESS, 152 W. 13th St., NEW YORK



# MILTON

By E. M. W. TILLYARD

\$5.00

"Extraordinarily stimulating, outspoken, brilliant and provocative, he has cleared the way to a proper understanding of Milton's genius and beliefs . . . a future generation will be deeply grateful to him for his work as a pioneer."

—H. L. MORROW, in *Everyman*.

"A penetrating study of that austere giant among the Poets."

—*The New York Times*.

The book is written in three parts, dealing respectively with Milton's Youth and Early Poems, The Period of Prose, and The Later Poems.

## Unpublished Letters from the Collection of John Wild

Edited by R. N. CAREW HUNT

*With Facsimile Reproductions*

\$3.00

Here are letters from Byron and Alexander Pope; a beauty from Lord Chesterfield; Henry of Navarre; Edmund Burke; Lady Hamilton, La Rochefoucauld; Voltaire; Correspondence between Richardson and Miss Pennington, and between Queen Caroline and Lady Byland, and many others. Perhaps the jewels of the collection are Shelley's request for credit from a bookseller, reciting his financial prospects. and Laurence Sterne's letter to his publisher, submitting the MS of "Tristram Shandy." Mr. Hunt has carefully annotated each letter, supplying relevant information regarding it.

**LINCOLN MACVEAGH**

THE DIAL PRESS, 152 W. 13th St., NEW YORK

## THE JOHNS HOPKINS STUDIES IN ROMANCE LITERATURES AND LANGUAGES

Edited by D. S. Blondheim, Gilbert Chinard, and  
H. Carrington Lancaster.

- Volume I. Volney et l'Amérique, by Gilbert Chinard, 1923. 208 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume II. Chateaubriand et la Bible: *Contribution à l'Etude des Sources des "Martyrs,"* by J. V. N. Smead, 1924. 166 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume III. The Genesis and Sources of Pierre Corneille's Tragedies from Médée to Pertharite, by Lawrence Melville Riddle, 1926. 222 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume IV. Chateaubriand and English Literature, by Meta Helena Miller, 1925. 204 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume V. Chryséide et Arimand; Tragi-Comédie de Jean Mairet (1625), par H. C. Lancaster, 1925. 174 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume VI. Gatien de Courtilz sieur du Verger, *Etude sur un Précurseur du Roman Réaliste en France*, par B. M. Woodbridge, 1925. 226 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume VII. Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, by Eunice Rathbone Goddard, 1927. 266 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume VIII. The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra: A literary and linguistic study with special reference to the Old French translation of Hagin, by Raphael Levy, 1927. 176 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume IX. The Vocabulary of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and its Relation to the French Romantic School, by John Nottingham Ware, 1927. 108 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume X. The Misterio de Los Reyes Magos: Its Position in the Development of the Mediaeval Legend of the Three Kings, by Winifred Sturdevant, 1927. 130 pp. \$1.25.
- Volume XI. Chateaubriand and Homer, with a study of some of the French sources of his classical information. By Charles Randall Hart, 1928. 176 pages. \$1.25.
- Volume XII. The Forerunners of Feminism in French Literature of the Renaissance, by Lula McDowell Richardson. 178 pages. \$1.25.
- Volume XIII. A Forgotten French Dramatist, Gabriel Gilbert (1620?-1680?), by Eleanor S. Pellet. (In press.)
- Volume XIV. Alcionée: Tragédie de Pierre Du Ryer (1637), by Henry Carrington Lancaster, 1930. 114 pages. \$1.25.
- Volume XV. The Influence of Ariosto's Epic and Lyric Poetry on Ronsard and His Group, by Alice Cameron, 1930. 206 pages. \$1.25.
- Volume XVI. Claude de L'Estoille, Poet and Dramatist, 1597-1652, by Richard Alexander Parker, 1930. 122 pages. \$1.25.
- Extra Volume I. Jefferson et les Idéologues d'Après sa Correspondance Inédite avec Destutt de Tracy, Cabanis, J.-B. Say et Auguste Comte, par Gilbert Chinard, 1925. 296 pages. \$2.00.
- Extra Volume II. The Commonplace Book of Thomas Jefferson, A Repertory of His Ideas on Government. By Gilbert Chinard, 1926. 404 pages. Paper, \$3.50; cloth, \$4.00.
- Extra Volume III. Louis Hue Girardin and Nicholas Gouin Dufief and their Relations with Thomas Jefferson. An Unknown Episode of the French Emigration in America. By Edith Phillips, 1926. 76 pages. 85 cents.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,

Baltimore, Maryland.





## *Latest Publications in German*

### **Oscar Burkhard: READINGS IN MEDICAL GERMAN**

An intermediate reader for students who require a knowledge of scientific terms. The texts are graded in difficulty, and the vocabulary forms a complete medical dictionary. *Illustrated.*

### **Hermann Löns: DIE HÄUSER VON OHLENHOF**

A collection of five stories from the original collection, depicting with realism and understanding life in a *Heidedorf* before 1914. Edited with German introduction, notes, exercises, and vocabulary, for intermediate use, by *E. P. Appelt*, University of Wisconsin.

### **Eduard Prokosch: DEUTSCHE SPRACHLEHRE**

A direct method beginning book, by an author who has established himself as a writer of eminently sound texts for the teaching of German. Thirty-two lessons are followed by sixteen supplementary reading texts and a *Synopsis of Grammar* in English.

### **IN PRESS**

#### **Gerhart Hauptmann: EINSAME MENSCHEN**

The authorized edition of this excellent play, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by Ernst Feise, Johns Hopkins University, and M. B. Evans, Ohio State University.

#### **Hans Franck: DER REGENBOGEN**

Excellent narrative prose for second year students, in ten stories. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by Stella M. Hinz, University of Wisconsin.



## **HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY**

NEW YORK      CHICAGO  
BOSTON      SAN FRANCISCO

# *Just Published!*

AN EXCLUSIVELY AUTHORIZED SCHOOL EDITION OF THE FAMOUS NOVEL

## ABSCHIED VOM PARADIES

BY FRANK THIESS

---

---

**A** BOOK written for adults—or children grown up—wherein they are made to understand that they may gaze over the wall, but they may never again enter the gate of the paradise they left behind. A sympathetic view of the ever-new problems of youth's inarticulate yearnings, friendships, and enthusiasms. This return to Kinderland, with its natural appeal to young readers comes near to perfection in its suitability as a first text. The editor, Miss O. G. Boetzkes, Whitworth College, has provided an account of the life and works of Dr. Thiess, Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises.

---

---

*D. C. Heath and Company*

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA DALLAS SAN FRANCISCO LONDON

---

---

*Modern French Stories for the Classroom*

*Greenfield's*

### PARMI LES CONTEURS MODERNES

Fourteen short stories by such noted French writers of today as René Bazin, Charles Foley, Pierre Mille, Marcel Naudaud, Henry Bordeaux, and Marcel Prévost—nine of the stories named by their respective authors as their greatest achievement in this type of work. . . . Stories of modernity—by modern authors—about modern people. . . . Bring the zest of today into the classroom with these stories of surpassing quality and beauty. . . . A most useful volume with vocabulary, notes, biographical sketches, and exercises. 235 pages, illustrated. \$0.84.

*Ginn and Company*

Boston New York Chicago San Francisco Atlanta Dallas Columbus